



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JANUARY 7, 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, Diane Chaffin, Kathryn Latsis, Chair Pro-Tem, Jamie Wollman, Rodney Brockelman, and Randall Miller.</p> <p>Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Asst. County Attorney; Kurtis Cotten, Engineer; Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; Alan White, Planner/Project Specialist; Loretta Daniel, Long Range Planning Program 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 Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Mr. Brockelman to accept the minutes from the December 3, 2019 Planning Commission meeting, as presented.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p>
APPROVAL OF THE MEETING CALENDAR FOR 2020	<p>The motion was made by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Mr. Miller to accept the 2020 Planning Commission meeting calendar, as presented.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p>
APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA POSTING LOCATIONS FOR 2020	<p>The motion was made by Ms. Chaffin and duly seconded by Mr. Sall to approve the Planning Commission Agenda posting locations, as presented.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p>

INTRODUCTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION BY-LAWS	The Planning Commissioners reviewed proposed revisions to the by-laws and generally supported the changes.
REGULAR ITEMS:	
ITEM 1	<p>Case No. SDP19-003, Copperleaf #23 / Specific Development Plan (SDP) – Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>Ms. Orkild-Larson introduced the case and confirmed public notice requirements had been met. She reported the applicant was proposing six pad sites with dimensional standards, perimeter landscaping, and uses, some of which would not be permitted on lot 1 to reduce impacts on residential development located west of site. She stated the proposal met requirements in Copperleaf Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) and the proposed landscape was consistent with other landscape along Quincy. She noted the Board of County Commissioners had approved the final plat at their morning Public Meeting.</p> <p>There were Planning Commissioner comments regarding proposed land uses, 24-hour convenience, high-intensity uses, outdoor storage, and buffers between commercial and residential.</p> <p>The applicant, Ryan McBreen with Norris Designs, gave a brief presentation and overview of the proposed project. He reported it was a 6 acre site and was one of last undeveloped sites in Copperleaf. He stated the proposal was in compliance with underlying zoning. He explained future development would occur down the road. He said to the west was a KB Homes product and to the south was Grand Peaks multi-family. Mr. McBreen reported the existing monument sign at Quincy and Picadilly would remain in place. He asked the Planning Commission for approval of the SDP.</p> <p>There were follow up discussions regarding the monument location and the buffer along the multi-family (MF) sites. It was noted the MF was not for sale so renters could move to the other side of the community; however, there were many uses the residents might like.</p> <p>Ms. Rieck opened the public hearing for comments. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.</p> <p>It was moved by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Ms. Chaffin in the case of SDP19-003, Copperleaf Filing No. 23 / Specific Development Plan, that the Planning Commissioners reviewed</p>

	<p>the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, listened to the applicant’s presentation and any public comment as presented at the public hearing, and moved 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 signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns. 2. The applicant shall comply with the recommendations of the fire district prior to issuance of a building permit. 3. The applicant shall address all City of Aurora comments prior to the issuance of a building permit. 4. Lot 1 (western most lot) shall not contain the intense uses identified in the Specific Development Plan (SDP19-003). <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes, Mr. Brockelman, Yes.</p>
<p>ITEM 2</p>	<p>Case No. LR19-006, Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) Amendment for Urban Residential Densities / Long Range (LR) – Alan White, Planner & Special Projects, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>Alan White, Planner, stated the public notice was adequate and the Planning Commission had jurisdiction. He provided an overview of potential infill parcels. He stated the proposed amendment would affect about 10-12 parcels at this time. He said each of the parcels would need to be rezoned, whether for single-family detached or attached developments. Mr. White explained there would be public hearings at both the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. He reported the proposal was to adjust densities for single-family detached from 1-6 to 1-8 du/ac and to change single-family attached from 6 to 12 du/ac to 8-16 du/ac. Mr. White reminded the Planning Commission of their request for a set of criteria, which the proposed amendment included criteria, as follows: shape or topography that constrained normal development practices; that it provided a suitable transition; and that it met small lot residential design standards. He said referrals were sent to 104 agencies and he had received 21 responses. Mr. White reported most of the responses were no comments/no concerns; however, he had</p>

received some comments from Littleton, Douglas County, and Cherry Hills Water and San District. He reported the Douglas County comments requested suitable transitions from development in Douglas County, which was included in item 2 regarding transitions. He explained the closest area in Douglas County was a mile away from a potential development in Arapahoe County. He said Cherry Hills Heights was located at the NE corner of Hampden and University and they had their own sewer/water district. Mr. White reported that he had talked with a representative of the district and let them know that any proposed changes in density, in that subdivision, would go through a rezoning process. He stated Littleton asked that we make the criteria mandatory; however, we didn't do that because we wanted to offer some flexibility in decision making. Mr. White said the amendment was not intended to be regulatory and making it mandatory would border on regulatory. He said Littleton also asked that we add a sixth bullet point about mitigating impacts of development, which is part of the land development process following the land development code. He explained staff did not make changes based on those referral comments. Mr. White reported staff brought this proposal forward because they wanted to make the Comp Plan more consistent with zoning in the Land Development Code and to bring the Comp Plan, and some of the recently adopted zone districts, more into alignment. He explained that all of the parcels in the urban residential land use category would require a public hearing if somebody were to propose a change. Mr. White reported that one of the reasons staff proposed this amendment was because if you changed the category to multi-family density, which would allow a denser townhome project, somebody else could purchase the property and develop multi-family at any density. He stated Tri-County Health Department supported the proposal because increased densities supported more walkable communities. He said staff recommended approval.

There were discussions regarding impacts to the Four Square Mile area, aging population, demand for townhomes, affordability, housing options, overcrowding, the location of the impacts, the number of referral responses received being a fair representation, consistency with other jurisdiction's densities, smaller lots as a trend, and if there were applicants waiting in the wings to apply if approved.

Ms. Rieck opened the public hearing for comments.

Joe Sutherland, 21125 E Hampden Place, member of East Arapahoe County Planning Commission said he was commenting as a citizen. He expressed concern over the need to maintain a crash zone. He

	<p>reported having lived in Seoul Korea for several years and they had millions of people living in an area the size of Denver – and it worked really well. He said they had great transit. He commented on how RTD was having a hard time making things work. He saw firsthand how increased density increased walkability in Seoul; however, he said if we jammed more people into specific infills they wouldn't be walking anywhere because the closest place to shop was a little Walmart, resulting in parking and traffic problems. He stated, if we are hoping developers will go out and develop cheaper property, that's was not going to happen.</p> <p>Ms. Rieck said the proposed, draft resolution stated County staff referred things to referral agencies and received no comment. She stated that should be revised to say we did receive comments.</p> <p>There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.</p> <p>It was moved by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Ms. Latsis in the case of LR19-006, Urban Residential Densities / Comprehensive Plan Amendment, that the Planning Commissioners read the proposed plan amendment and staff report, considered additional information as presented during the public hearing, and found themselves in agreement with Staff findings one (1) through four (4) as set forth in the Staff report dated December 12, 2019, and therefore approved the amendment, as requested.</p> <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Rieck, No; Ms. Chaffin, No; Mr. Miller, No; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes; Mr. Brockelman, Yes.</p>
ADJOURNMENT	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>