



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, AUGUST 18, 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; 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; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Sarah White, Engineer; Kurtis Cotton, Engineer; Kathleen Hammer, Planner II; Terri Maulik, Duty 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. Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager, served as moderator for the meeting, held on-line through the Teams platform and by telephone call-in. Mr. Reynolds called the roll and noted a quorum of the Board was present.</p>
DISCLOSURE MATTERS	<p>Mr. Reynolds explained the criteria for conflicts with items on the agenda with respect to due process requirements.</p> <p>Mr. Sall noted that he was employed by the architectural firm that worked on the East Virginia Village projects, but had no financial interest.</p> <p>Ms. Latsis noted that she has been a client of the architecture firm, but had not had interactions on the cases being considered tonight.</p> <p>Ms. Sauve noted that she had previously heard presentations related to all the projects as part of the Four Square Mile Neighborhoods Association, prior to her appointment to the Planning Commission. She felt she could make an impartial decision.</p> <p>Mr. Hill stated there were no Planning Commission member conflicts with the matters before them based on these disclosures.</p>

GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:	
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES	<p>The motion was made by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Mr. Brockelman to accept the minutes from the August 4, 2020, Planning Commission meeting, as amended, for minor administrative corrections.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p>
REGULAR ITEMS:	
ITEM 1	<p>CASE NO PP19-002, EAST VIRGINIA VILLAGE / PRELIMINARY PLAT (PP) – Kat Hammer, Planner II, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>Ms. Hammer introduced both Case No PP19-002 and SDP20-00. She stated the hearings had been properly noticed and the Planning Commission (PC) had jurisdiction to proceed. She explained the presentations would be combined; however, each case would need a separate motion and vote. She presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. She reported the proposed project consisted of 74 townhomes. Ms. Hammer provided a history of the zoning of the property by General Development Plan and noted that the SDP was step two of the three-step Planned Unit Development (PUD) process. She reminded the PC that they would be making a final decision on the SDP. Ms. Hammer noted highlights of the development, explained staff’s findings, and indicated that a condition of the SDP approval would be contingent upon finalization of the General Development Plan (GDP) documents.</p> <p>Ms. Latsis asked about triggers for future review of warrants for signalization of the intersection given comments from the Sheriff’s Department.</p> <p>Mr. Cotton explained the basis of the engineering review that was completed for the project and also noted that a joint study between the City & County of Denver and Arapahoe County was currently underway. He stated outcomes from the study could potentially affect changes along the corridor, although the side-street volume was not anticipated to trigger signalization requirements.</p> <p>Mr. Brockelman had questions about the number of parking spaces referenced and how those were accommodated on site.</p>

Ms. Hammer briefly addressed this and deferred further explanation to the applicant.

Paul Shoukas, PCS Group Company, thanked the PC members and staff for their time and patience with the process in moving cases forward during the pandemic. He introduced the project team members and presented a PowerPoint presentation, a copy of which was retained for the record. Mr. Shoukas stated the project provided for a good transition in density between existing homes and industrial properties across Quebec St. He reported the developer, Century Communities, had built homes in 17 states and had 240 employees in Colorado, with headquarters in Greenwood Village/Arapahoe County. Mr. Shoukas addressed public outreach that occurred in conjunction with the development of the GDP and SDP. He showed a copy of the GDP to refresh memories. He noted that the number of units, number of units per building, and the number of stories and building height were all established by the GDP, along with the parking requirement and on-site open space requirements. He addressed landscape buffers and pedestrian sidewalks, as well as, a pocket park and the access to the property incorporated into the GDP. Mr. Shoukas presented a comparison of the proposed SDP and the approved GDP. He explained that one of the access points had been changed to a right-in/right-out only; which helped address neighborhood concerns about cut-through traffic. He reported a ten-foot-wide walkway would run along the entire Quebec frontage. He also pointed out a wrought-iron fence that would help provide buffering from adjoining homes and better definition for the neighborhood. Mr. Shoukas explained the layout of buildings, greenbelt areas, alleys and parking. He stated the parking included individual two-car garages, parking within individual driveways and on-street parking; the total exceeded the minimum parking requirements of the GDP. He also explained the proposed fencing. He stated the pocket park had a perimeter fence due to the proximity to Quebec St., but also had a pedestrian connection to the sidewalk. He said the park would not be for exclusive use of the new development. He reported the adjoining neighborhood seemed amendable to the more cohesive fencing than what existed today and to the buffer, trail and pocket park. Mr. Shoukas said additional fencing had been included in the plan to shield headlights from cars using the alleys to access garage and driveway parking. He provided additional exhibits on individual units and decorative fencing, spacing of buildings, entrance monument signage, and placement of privacy walls. He stated the playground equipment would accommodate children ages 5 to 12, as well as, a grassed play area. Mr. Shoukas presented a slide that outlined compliance of the project with the Comprehensive

Plan/Four Square Mile SubArea Plan, the Land Development Code, and the General Development Plan.

There were discussions concerning the fire department approval for access and turn-around, garage sizes, guest parking, on-street parking, signage, green space, park maintenance responsibility, park size, other like products built by Century Homes, whether the enabling documents for the HOA would allow for privatizing the pocket park in the future, if the units would be for-sale or rentals, sound insulation as part of construction standards, and if the builder would be implementing any green standards.

Ms. Rieck announced that public comment period for both Items 1 and 2 would be combined. She opened the public hearing and directed Mr. Reynolds to call on each caller for comment.

Frank and Carla Bennett on Pontiac Way, stated they lived approximately 100 yards from the development. They had concerns about the right in/out onto Colorado Avenue and people cutting through their neighborhood. They noted an increase in traffic and failure of people to stop at the stop sign. They expressed their appreciation to the developer who had accommodated many concerns of neighbors and said they were pleased with the development overall.

Jim Stone, Poplar Street, stated he was the coordinator for the 22 homes backing up to the development. He said he had communicated with Cindy at Century Homes. He was concerned that homeowners would rent out their homes after purchase and wanted a way to prevent that from happening. He also expressed concern over the design of the right-in/right-out such that the as-built construction forced drivers to use as intended.

Sharon Deer, Pontiac Way, expressed concern with the right-in/right-out and stated people would misuse this unless a median was put in. She was also concerned about cut-through traffic by returning residents wanting to turn right into the development from Colorado Ave.

Mark Lampert, Four Square Mile Neighborhood Association, E. Colorado Drive, noted that all cases tonight were in Four Square Mile and appreciated that these two items were combined for expediency. He thanked Century Communities for their work with the 4SMNA, incorporating many of the comments into the GDP. He appreciated that Century Communities worked with the Denver residents to the west. He also appreciated that the Arapahoe County

Planning Commission was willing to hear from Denver residents. Mr. Lampert stated that there was a natural trail coming in from the west that tied into the pocket park that seems to be accommodated as a neighborhood access. He stated the development was consistent with the 4SM Subarea Plan density recommendations.

Cindy Myers, Century Communities, responded to questions and comments from citizens. She stated Colorado law made it difficult to prohibit renting of units by owners, but the intent was to market these as for-sale units to be occupied by the buyer. She noted that the design of the access points and the additional right-turn lane on Quebec was designed to address concerns with stacking at intersections and turns. She explained the design of the “pork chop” controlling ingress/egress on Colorado Avenue would have vertical curbs to help function as intended. She said Century Communities intended to provide direct access to the park by pedestrians in the neighborhoods.

Ms. Hammer reported having received email during the meeting from a neighbor with similar concerns about the access on Colorado Avenue. She wanted this concern noted for the record.

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

It was moved by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Ms. Sauve, in the case of PP19-002, East Virginia Village / Preliminary Plan, the Planning Commissioners reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, have listened to the applicant’s presentation and the public comment as presented at the public hearing, and moved to recommend approval of the application based on the findings in the staff report and subject to the following condition:

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

The vote was:

Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes, Mr. Brockelman, Yes.

CASE NO SDP20-001, EAST VIRGINIA VILLAGE / SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN (SDP) – Kat Hammer, Planner II, Public Works and Development (PWD)

The presentation for Items 1 and 2 were done in conjunction with each other.

It was moved by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Mr. Brockelman, in the case of SDP20-001, East Virginia Village / Specific Development Plan, the Planning Commissioners reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, have listened to the applicant’s presentation and the public comment as presented at the public hearing, and moved to approve the application based on the findings in the staff report and subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to signature of the final copy of the plans, the applicant must address Public Works and Development Staff comments and concerns.**
- 2. Approval of Case No SDP20-001, East Virginia Village / Specific Development Plan is contingent on the approval of Case No PP19-002, East Virginia Village / Preliminary Plat.**
- 3. Final documents for the approved General Development Plan, Case No GDP18-005, must be submitted and approved prior to approval of final documents for Case No SDP20-001, East Virginia Village / Specific Development Plan.**

The vote was:

Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes; Mr. Brockelman, Yes.

ITEM 3

CASE NO PM19-002, AVERE / MINOR SUBDIVISION (PM) – Kat Hammer, Planner II, Public Works and Development (PWD)

Ms. Hammer introduced the application and established jurisdiction for the Planning Commission to hear the case. She presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. She reported REVA High Line, LLC, was seeking a minor subdivision to combine properties located at 1860, 1880, and 1890 S Quebec Way into one 4.39 acres lot under a PUD zoning. Ms. Hammer provided a history of the property including a plat in 1948 and a Specific Development Plan/Zoning in 2018. She explained if the PP was approved an Administrative Site Plan would be required. Ms. Hammer reported that Molly Orkild-Larson, who was the case planner for the project, was unable to attend tonight, but that Molly had spoken with a neighbor and explained that the hearing was for the plat only and that further aspects of the development plan would not be heard this evening. Ms. Hammer reviewed the staff findings and noted that the proposal was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the subdivision regulations within the Land Development Code.

Mr. Nix, applicant, REVA Development, explained that the site plan had been included with the plat application to refresh memories of the project, even though the hearing was only for the subdivision. He said the development team was excited to have reached this milestone and looked forward to moving ahead with the project.

Ms. Rieck opened the hearing for public comments.

Mark Lampert, representing the Four Square Mile Neighborhoods Association, stated the neighborhood comments were voiced to the developer in 2018 at the time of the SDP. He expressed appreciation for the applicant considering concerns of neighbors across the canal at that time. He said the 4SM area looked forward to seeing the development move forward.

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

It was moved by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Mr. Miller, in the case of PM19-002, Avere on the High Line / Minor Subdivision, that the Planning Commissioners reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, have listened to the applicant’s presentation and the public comment as presented at the public hearing, and moved to recommend

	<p>approval of the application, based on the findings in the staff report and subject to the following conditions:</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. 2. The applicant shall place a note on the final plat identifying the reception number of the blanket easement for the dry utilities. 3. Prior to the recording of the approved mylar, the applicant shall pay a total amount of cash in lieu of \$313,389.44 to be distributed as follows: Schools: \$121,546.53; Public Parks: \$184,169.19; and Other Public Purposes: \$7,673.72. <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes; Mr. Brockelman, Yes.</p>
<p>ANNOUNCEMENTS AND QUESTIONS</p>	<p>It was announced that the next Planning Commission meeting was scheduled for September 1, 2020.</p>
<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>