

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 2020**

ATTENDANCE	<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:</p> <p>Jane Rieck, Chair; Kathryn Latsis, Chair Pro-Tem; Richard Sall, Lynn Sauve, Rodney Brockelman, and Randall Miller</p> <p>Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Asst. County Attorney; Sue Liu, Engineer III; Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager; and members of the public.</p>
CALL TO ORDER	<p>Chair Rieck called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted a quorum of the Board was present. This meeting was held through the Teams platform and with public participation through call-in by telephone. Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager, served as meeting facilitator and explained the directions for participating in the meeting.</p>
DISCLOSURE MATTERS	<p>There were no Planning Commission member conflicts with the matters before them.</p>
GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:	
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES	<p>The motion was made by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Ms. Sauve to accept the minutes from the October 20, 2020, Planning Commission meeting, as presented.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p>
REGULAR ITEMS:	
ITEM 1	<p>CASE NO SD20-001, SKY RANCH METRO DISTRICT NO. 3, 4 & 5 AMENDMENTS AND 6, 7 & 8 NEW / SPECIAL DISTRICT (SD) – Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>Jurisdiction for the public hearing was established; legal noticing requirements of the Land Development Code have been met.</p>

The Staff Report to the Planning Commission and all attached exhibits and any presentations from the public hearing are part of the record of this public hearing.

Ms. Larson noted the hearing had been properly noticed and established jurisdiction for the Planning Commission (PC) to proceed. She presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was included for the record. She introduced the application, explained the basis of the staff review, and noted that Jason Simmons, of HTS, was present to assist with answering questions. She explained that Mr. Simmons was retained by Arapahoe County to review the financial aspects of the Sky Ranch Special District service plans. Ms. Orkild-Larson stated staff recommended approval of the amendments for District numbers 3, 4 and 5 and approval of the new Districts 6, 7 and 8, based on the findings outlined in the staff report.

Mark Harding, Pure Cycle Water, representing the Sky Ranch development, presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. He introduced Mary Ann M. McGeady and Suzanne Meintzer, the consultant team responsible for preparing the submitted service plans. He stated both Ms. McGeady and Ms. Meintzer were available to answer questions. Mr. Harding outlined the service plans being requested. He explained the changes to the service plans expand the debt authorization from \$166 million, as approved in 2004, to \$312 million. Mr. Harding provided examples and exhibits demonstrating the types of improvements that would be made through the metropolitan district service plan, including potential improvements to the interchange with I-70, which was currently the subject of a 1601 study with the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) and Arapahoe County. He reported other public improvements to be financed through the service plans would include drainage plans, utilities such as water and sewer lines, and other infrastructure to serve the Sky Ranch multi-use development. He compared the proposed mill levies with other master-planned projects in the area within Arapahoe, Adams County, and local cities. He said they were consistent with respect to costs to tax payers. Mr. Harding felt the request was respectful of the tax burden that would be carried by residents and businesses within the service boundary.

Mr. Brockelman expressed concern with the near doubling of the debt level, while recognizing that the original service plans were approved 16 years ago, and the ability of the development to be successful in the long term with that debt level.

	<p>Ms. Rieck asked about the ability to get the infrastructure put into place without having to raise the debt level again, noting the residential component had been decreased somewhat and the commercial aspects had been increased. Ms. Rieck noted that the projections had been developed by experts, but also that there were no caps on the O&M mill levy or the RIM. She also noted that the HTS review raised some questions, but found the plan to be sound.</p> <p>Ms. Rieck opened the hearing for public comments. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.</p> <p>It was moved by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Mr. Brockelman, in the case of SD20-001, Sky Ranch Metropolitan Districts – Existing Service Plan Amendments and Creation of Service Plans for New Districts, that the Planning Commission reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, listened to the applicant’s presentation and the public comment as presented at the public hearing and moved to recommend approval of the application to the Board of County Commissioners, based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant will make changes or modifications to the Service Plans as recommended by the Public Works staff. 2. The applicant will address any internal or external referral comments. <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis, Yes; Mr. Brockelman, Yes.</p>
<p>ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS</p>	<p>It was noted the November 17, 2020 Planning Commission meeting would be canceled. The next Planning Commission meeting would be held on December 1, 2020.</p> <p>Ms. Yeckes thanked everyone for being present and also thanked Veterans for their service, as the following day would be the national holiday to honor U.S. Veterans.</p>
<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>