

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, MAY 19, 2020**

<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	<p>A regular meeting of the Arapahoe County Planning Commission was called and held in accordance with the statutes of the State of Colorado and the Arapahoe County Land Development Code. The following Planning Commission members were in attendance through participation in a Teams meeting or through a Teams call-in telephone number:</p> <p>Jane Rieck, Chair; Richard Sall, Lynn Sauve, Kathryn Latsis, Chair Pro-Tem, Jamie Wollman, Rodney Brockelman, and Randall Miller.</p> <p>Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Asst. County Attorney; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; Caitlyn Cahill, Zoning and Animal Control Manager; Michelle Lantz, Zoning Inspector; Alan White, Planner/Project Specialist; Loretta Daniel, Long Range Planning Program Manager; Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager. A public participation call-in number was provided, but no members of the public joined the meeting.</p>
<b>CALL TO ORDER</b>	<p>Chair Rieck called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted a quorum of the Board was present.</p>
<b>DISCLOSURE MATTERS</b>	<p>There were no Planning Commission member conflicts with the matters before them.</p>
<b>GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:</b>	
<b>APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES</b>	<p>The motion was made by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Mr. Brockelman to accept the minutes from the January 21, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, as presented.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously, with Ms. Latsis abstaining as she had not been present for the January 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.</p>
<b>STUDY SESSION ITEMS:</b>	
<b>ITEM 1</b>	<p><b>Bennett-Watkins Area Vision Study / Tier 1 Comprehensive Plan Study – Alan White and Loretta Daniel, Long Range Planning</b></p> <p>Mr. White gave a brief review from the January study session on the purpose and location of the Bennett-Watkins Area Vision Study, as</p>

	<p>well as, the decision to change the name of the project from the less descriptive “Tier 1” reference from the Comprehensive Plan. He gave a presentation on the new project web site that was under development with the County’s Communications Services Department, showing key maps, information detail boxes, and the use of tabs that would change over time. He explained the tabs might, for example, provide results of the survey once it had been completed and then later be used to present alternatives that were under review. Mr. White reported the web site would also include a project timeline. He stated the web site was anticipated to go live late July or early August. He also explained the use of an advisory committee and asked for recommendations from the Planning Commission for members to serve on this committee.</p> <p>One recommendation was received.</p> <p>Mr. White reported, in addition to the web site, staff would provide additional outreach through use of post card announcements, I-70 Scout news releases and advertisements. He said staff was looking into tools for online interactive events and other opportunities to engage the public, such as a telephone town hall, and might hold in-person open houses if that became feasible as COVID-19 related concerns resolved. Mr. White said staff requested and obtained feedback on working through the project under our currently limited conditions for direct public outreach using more traditional methods such as open houses.</p> <p>There was consensus among the PC members that the project should move forward, that opportunities for public involvement and information sharing were important in order to get responses that were truly representative of the viewpoints in the study area, and that the project name was more descriptive for public understanding. There was a question about changing the Tier 1 reference in the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Ms. Daniel explained that would likely be delayed until we had results from the study that might influence changes needed to the Comprehensive Plan document in conjunction with the anticipated approval of a subarea plan.</p>
<p><b>ITEM 2</b></p>	<p><b>Setbacks in Agricultural and Rural Residential Zone Districts affecting Accessory Structures and Residential Structures – Michelle Lantz and Caitlyn Cahill, Zoning</b></p> <p>Ms. Lantz introduced the item and presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. She explained the purpose of</p>

	<p>the proposed Land Development Code amendment, the conditions that resulted from the current requirements in agricultural areas where agricultural uses and buildings, such as barns, might precede the location of a house on the property, and the affected zone districts.</p> <p>Questions and comments from the Planning Commission included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are there any stipulations on what the accessory building can be used for? If someone is building a garage to house tractors, would that be acceptable in front of a house?</li> <li>▪ Are there design criteria for what these buildings could look like and a maximum height and size?</li> <li>▪ If existing buildings are already less than 100 feet from the front property line, would County require owners to take down those buildings after this is passed, or would those be “grandfathered”?</li> <li>▪ Change seems reasonable, but what was the history/purpose of the way the code was originally written? Is it valid to give up the current requirements taking those reasons into account?</li> <li>▪ What lot sizes would this change apply to?</li> <li>▪ How was the decision made to establish the setback as 100 feet?</li> <li>▪ From which point, with respect to the adjoining road, is the 100 feet measured (i.e., centerline of road, edge of pavement)? How is the location of the true property line determined?</li> <li>▪ Would the change improve consistency between the zone districts, and is that important?</li> <li>▪ Makes sense to allow flexibility to use the land in a way best suited for locating farming uses and for building a house based on the characteristics of the specific property.</li> <li>▪ Good to change the code rather than to allow continuing variance requests that do not clearly meet the criteria for BOA approval. How many variance requests for this purpose have been received?</li> </ul> <p>Ms. Lantz and Ms. Cahill stated staff would further evaluate the proposal,, moving forward with these questions and comments in mind. It was noted the proposed code change would be further reviewed with opportunity for public comment through public hearings with the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.</p>
<p><b>ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS FOR STAFF</b></p>	<p>It was reported there were no business or study items scheduled for the June 2<sup>nd</sup> regularly scheduled meeting. Staff proposed to use the June 2<sup>nd</sup> date for an additional technology testing date due to</p>

	<p>difficulties encountered with tonight’s meeting. Staff reported they anticipated having business items for the June 16<sup>th</sup> regular meeting date.</p> <p>It was announced that the Public Works and Development Department opened to the public on a limited, appointment-only basis, beginning Monday, May 18<sup>th</sup>. It was noted most staff would continue working remotely due to social distancing needs related to the COVID-19 health crisis. Visitors and staff would need to wear masks and observe limited occupancy and spacing requirements when in the office or working in field positions.</p>
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>