

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 2018**

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>Mark Brummel; Jane Rieck, Chair; Richard Sall, Diane Chaffin, Kathryn Latsis, Jamie Wollman, and Randall Miller.</p> <p>Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Asst. County Attorney; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Sarah White, Engineer; Kurtis Cotten, Engineer; Bill Skinner, Senior Planner; Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner; Kathleen Hammer, Planner II; 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.</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 Commissioner Latsis and duly seconded by Commissioner Wollman to accept the minutes from the November 20, 2018, Planning Commission meeting, as presented.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p>
REGULAR ITEMS:	
<p>Ms. Rieck noted the order of the items on the agenda would be changed due to a flight schedule for an out-of-state applicant. She announced Item 4 on the agenda would be heard first.</p>	
ITEM 4	<p>Case No. FDP18-003, Copperleaf Filing No. 19 [Affinity]/Final Development Plan (FDP) – Bill Skinner, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>Mr. Skinner introduced the case and established jurisdiction for the public hearing. He provided the Planning Commission (PC) with</p>

basic information on the proposed FDP for 170 senior housing units. He stated the project would not create an issue with the density caps for multi-family residential for Copperleaf. Mr. Skinner addressed a request for a parking reduction. He said the PC may make a recommendation on the requested alteration to Land Development Code (LDC) standards as part of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) application and the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) may approve it as a deviation from the minimum requirements. Mr. Skinner also addressed trail and pedestrian connections.

Robert Ketner, Affinity at Copperleaf LLC, applicant, expressed appreciation for a change in the order of the agenda to accommodate his travel schedule. He stated the company's home was in Spokane; however, the company works in the Front Range of Colorado and considered it "home." He explained the concept of active seniors desiring congregant living arrangements. He described the amenities and showed photographic examples of other projects in Colorado Springs, Loveland, and Fort Collins as examples of what would be included in the Copperleaf facility. He reported they would work with the adjoining land owner to try to share the costs for the additional sidewalks. He stated they had no objections to any of the requirements or conditions of approval from County staff. Mr. Ketner addressed the requested parking ratio, which was based on other facilities. He indicated it would be a very comfortable parking ratio for this project.

There were discussions concerning maintenance responsibilities, landscaping, outdoor amenities, parking ratio, site access, and how active these senior living communities were.

Mr. Ketner responded to questions concerning the parking ratio. He cited the ITE Manual standard for senior living facilities. He noted there would be a range of age of residents, levels of independence with respect to driving, and the apartments could be occupied by a single individual or a couple, all of which would affect parking needs. He stated, the project, as proposed, was actually over-parked; however, they choose to err on the side of additional parking when no street parking was available nearby.

There were discussions about the amount of traffic generated by visitors. It was noted most didn't stay overnight. Further, many of the residents had jobs off the property during the day, which freed up daytime parking for visitors of other residents.

Ms. Rieck opened the hearing for public comments. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

	<p>It was moved by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Mr. Brummel, in the case of FDP18-003, Copperleaf No. 19 [Affinity] / Final Development Plan, that the Planning Commission reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, have listened to the applicant’s presentation and any public comment as presented at the hearing, and move to recommend approval of this application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns. 2. Approval of Case No. FDP18-003, Copperleaf No. 19 [Affinity] / Final Development Plan is contingent upon the approval of Case No. PAR18-002, Copperleaf No. 19 / Administrative Replat. 3. Sidewalks on the south side of E Quincy Avenue, extending from the west edge of the subject property to the intersection of E Quincy Avenue and Copperleaf Boulevard, will be constructed prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for improvements shown in this FDP application. 4. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant shall provide proof of agreeable solutions to concerns raised by the following agencies; Xcel Energy, East Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District, South Metro Fire Protection District. <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.</p>
<p>ITEM 1</p>	<p>Case No. PM18-003, Olson/Minor Subdivision – Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>Ms. Orkild-Larson established jurisdiction for the public hearing and introduced the application, which was a request to correct an illegal subdivision. She noted the property owner did not wish to make a presentation, but was available for questions.</p>

	<p>Mr. Miller asked for additional details on how the property managed to not be subdivided. He also asked how the adjoining property was being addressed.</p> <p>Gerald Olson, applicant and owner, addressed the Planning Commission's questions about the history of the property leading up to their purchase of the property in 2004. He explained a number of building permits had been issued and the home and additional buildings were put up. He stated this land use process was required for the County to recognize their 20-acre lot as legal. Mr. Olson explained they had no plans to make changes to the property other than to live there and use it as they always have. He said they would like to get the issue resolved in case they ever needed to sell the property.</p> <p>It was moved by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Mr. Sall, in the case of PM18-003, Olson / Minor Subdivision, that the Planning Commission reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, and have listened to the applicant's presentation and the public comment as presented at the public hearing, and move to approve this application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following condition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to signature of the final copy of this plat the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns. <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.</p>
<p>ITEM 2</p>	<p>Case No. LE18-001, Byers Park & Recreation District / Location and Extent (LE) – Kat Hammer, Planner II, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>Ms. Hammer established jurisdiction for the public hearing and introduced the application. She provided some history of the use of the property and public input to the proposed changes to the property conducted by the Byers Park & Recreation District. She stated staff recommended approval with conditions.</p> <p>Rita Davis, Byers Park & Recreation District, introduced the members of the team who were present. She explained some of the Board members were new since the project was started and were requesting approval.</p>

Melissa Kendrick, representing the Byers Park & Recreation District, presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. She showed the location of the property and reported the property was acquired in 1986 from the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR). She reported a subdivision exemption was approved by the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) last week for the public use of the property. Ms. Kendrick reported the District had been working since 2013 with a master plan, which determined the Community Park would be first priority. She said, in 2014 and 2015, planning grants were awarded by the Arapahoe County Open Spaces Department. Ms. Kendrick reviewed the site plan and the various facilities to be included. She said the entire site would be graded, the drainage upgraded, and the soil amended to improve the conditions inherited from UPRR. She reported the park would have a turf area and a new playground and sport court. She reported there would be two pavilions and eventually the restroom facility would be replaced. She added that the berm would be removed, even though it meant losing some trees, to help with visibility of the park and preventing vandalism that has long been a problem. Ms. Kendrick explained access would remain in its current location. She stated the District was in agreement with Staff's recommended conditions of approval.

There were discussions regarding street parking. It was noted parallel parking along the street would continue to be available.

Ms. Rieck opened the public hearing for comments.

Shirley Gunter, 150 S Jewel, stated Byers definitely needed a new park. She felt, however, that the park design was too elaborate. She stated the community did not want to see the trees removed and the site leveled out. She said it was also a high budget for the District.

John Walls, 69334 E Briarwood Pl, said he felt the \$800,000 cost to replace the park was very high. He felt there were things in the park that could be fixed. He noted the cost for picnic tables and trash cans was too high. He did not see the need for concrete as a boundary for the playground. Further, Mr. Walls did not want to see the mature trees removed.

Ms. Rieck asked who was providing the funding for the park.

Ms. Davis noted the award of funding through Arapahoe County Open Spaces. She reported additional funds had been requested from Greater Colorado Outdoors (submitted November 11, 2018) and Colorado Health Foundation (submitted October 15, 2018). She

explained they would know about the funding by March, 2019, which fell within the timeframe for using the Open Spaces grant. Ms. Davis stated the trees would be replaced with more sustainable and resilient varieties than the Cottonwoods that existed currently. She said they would take some time to grow large enough to provide the same shade.

There were continued discussions about funding, timeline, and if the project would be completed in phases. Ongoing maintenance was considered, as was vandalism to play equipment, and the district's overall budget.

Another concerned area resident (name inaudible and did not sign in to speak) felt the park was not too big for Byers. She reported there was new residential development in the area and she welcomed a place to take her grandkids to play. She reported having surveyed the kids in the area to determine what they wanted in their park. She stated Byers residents were happy to help maintain the park. She had been a part the park planning process since its inception and people did not object then. She explained the park was being completed with funds that would not come directly from the Byers residents.

There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

It was moved by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Ms. Wollman, in the case of Case No. LE18-001, Byers Park and Recreation District / Location and Extent, that the Planning Commission reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, listened to the applicant's presentation and any public comment as presented at the hearing, and hereby move to approve the application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns.**

The vote was:

Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis, Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.

ITEM 3

Case No. SDPZ18-002, Dove Valley Business Park / Specific Development Plan 5th Amendment – Kat Hammer, Planner II, Public Works and Development (PWD)

Ms. Hammer established jurisdiction for the public hearing and introduced the case. She explained the applicant was requesting to rezone the property, combine parcels, and then apply different use areas within the Dove Valley Master Development Plan. She explain that the Administrative Site Plan (ASP) would address site details; which process would not require Planning Commission action. Ms. Hammer noted condition #2 related to the ASP and that condition #4 addressed issues from South Metro Fire, which would also be worked out as part of the ASP process.

Ms. Wollman asked about the discussion in the staff report related to egress onto Potomac and the inability to make left turns. She said there was a lot of traffic on Potomac, especially during rush hour. She wanted to know if that was being address. She noted there were numerous allowed uses under the proposed zoning which would generate more traffic.

Ms. Hammer noted a traffic report was part of the application. She stated it would be a right-in/right-out access point only. She explained the traffic study did not warrant a traffic signal was needed.

Ms. Rieck asked staff about the status of their requirements.

Ms. Hammer noted the comments from South Metro Fire were actually in relation to the ASP; however, they were included as a condition of approval with the rezoning.

Brian Cooney, Opus Development Company, presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. He noted the location of the site within the overall Dove Valley Business Park boundary and showed the site plan, the overall land use plan for the Dove Valley MDP, and the relationship of use areas within the business park. He reported these would be speculative developments with leased space. He explained the applicants were proposing to give up use area E, which included outdoor storage, and adding use area F, which allowed a broader range of light manufacturing uses. Mr. Cooney reported a letter from Dove Valley, in support of the request, was included with the application.

Ms. Rieck opened the public hearing for comments. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

	<p>It was moved by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Ms. Chaffin, in the case of SDPZ18-002 Dove Valley Business Park Specific Development Plan, 5th Amendment to the Master Development Plan, that the Planning Commission reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, listened to the applicant’s presentation and any public comment as presented at the hearing, and hereby move to approve the application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to the signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns. 2. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must provide evidence that required infrastructure and drainage will be provided by and is within the infrastructure and capacity of the applicable service provider(s). 3. The development shall comply with all Federal Aviation Administration requirements and permitting. 4. The development shall meet all South Metro Fire Rescue design requirements. <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.</p>
<p>ANNOUNCEMENTS</p>	<p>Mr. Reynolds provided a brief update on the proposal to allow back yard bees and chickens in residential areas. He reported the next Planning Commission meeting would be held on a special meeting date of January 8, 2019 due to the New Year holiday falling on the regular meeting date.</p>
<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>