

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, May 5, 2026**

ATTENDANCE	<p>A regular meeting of the Arapahoe County Planning Commission (PC) was called and held in accordance with the statutes of the State of Colorado and the Arapahoe County Land Development Code (LDC).</p> <p>The following Planning Commission members were in attendance: Randall Miller, Chair; Brooke Moore; Dave Mohrhaus, Chair Pro-Tem; Richard Sall; Lynn Sauve; and Adrienne Wolf.</p> <p>Also present were Matt Hader, Senior Assistant County Attorney; Jason Reynolds, Planning Division Manager; Ava Pecherzewski, Development Review Planning Manager (moderator); Ceila Rethamel, Engineering Services Division Manager; Eva Maines, Engineering Program Manager; Kat Hammer, Senior Planner; Raye Fields, Planner II; Emily Gonzalez, Engineer; Joseph Boateng, Engineer III; and Kim Lynch, Planning Technician.</p>
CALL TO ORDER	<p>Mr. Miller called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m., and the roll was called. The meeting was held in person and through the Granicus Live Manager platform with telephone call-in for staff members and the public.</p>
PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:	
ITEM 1	<p>CASE NO. GDP25-003, RESIDENCES AT PLATTE CANYON / GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (GDP)– KAT HAMMER, SENIOR PLANNER; JOSEPH BOATENG, ENGINEER III – PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT (PWD)</p> <p>Mr. Hader cited the Land Development Code Chapter 5 - Section 2 notice requirements and stated they had been met; therefore, the PC had jurisdiction to proceed.</p> <p>Ms. Hammer stated the applicant Highland Development Company, on behalf of five property owners, was requesting a positive recommendation from the Planning Commission to the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) for a GDP comprised of eight parcels, located at the southeast corner of S. Platte Canyon Rd. and W. Mineral Dr. She explained the applicant was requesting a rezone of the property to Planned Unit Development (PUD) to allow single-family detached homes at a density of 4-6 dwelling units per acre, and to provide flexibility in the GDP document, also sought allowable uses for single-family attached and townhome products at a density of up to 16 dwelling</p>

units per acre. She said the GDP proposed two access points from S. Platte Canyon Road, with primary access proposed at the southern portion of the development, aligned with W. Canyon Trail, in Douglas County. She stated that the secondary access, proposed for emergency vehicles only, was located at the northern portion of the development. She stated the GDP also showed on-site open space and detention on the north side of the property. She described the surrounding properties, outlined the comments received from public outreach, the potential connection to adjacent trails, a pocket park for future residents and existing neighbors, and improvements to S. Platte Canyon Road. She said if this application was approved, the development would require approval of additional applications, including: a Specific Development Plan, a Preliminary Subdivision Plat, an Administrative Site Plan, and a Final Subdivision Plat. She concluded that staff recommended approval of this project, which generally conformed to the Arapahoe County (AC) Comp Plan and the Land Development Code, zoning regulations, and procedures for a PUD.

Mr. Matt Norcross, of PCS Group, introduced the development team of Mr. Dash Stethem of Highland Development Co., Mr. Charlie Keener, Brightlighter Engineering, and Mr. Brandon Wilson, Traffic Engineer with SM Roach. Mr. Norcross further described the community outreach process and stated the key concerns raised were an increase in local traffic, trail access, and impact on neighbors' views. He confirmed the developer's intent to provide trail access and to further evaluate traffic if higher-density products were indicated further along in the Specific Development Plan phase, if this GDP was approved.

Mr. Miller opened the hearing for public comments. There were no members of the public present, and there were two callers who raised concerns about increased traffic and the trail connection and crossing for S. Platte Canyon Road. The public hearing was closed.

There was discussion regarding the existing Traffic Impact Study (TIS). Mr. Boateng, AC Engineer, explained that the current TIS showed a Level of Service (LOS) of A-D, indicating no major impact was expected. Mr. Keener said the existing four homes would likely be demolished and redeveloped, depending on which product was chosen for development. In response to the caller's questions, the team responded that if the GDP was approved, the next phase of Preliminary Plat and Specific Development Plan would address these concerns, as density would be established and TIS would be reevaluated. Mr. Wilson confirmed the trail crossing issue was not specified in the GDP, but the development team was committed to including this important aspect in the final community plan to be developed.

The motion to recommend for approval was made by Mr. Mohrhaus and duly seconded by Ms. Sauve, in the case of in

	<p>GDP25-003, Residence at Platte Canyon, Rezone to Planned Unit Development, General Development Plan, I have reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, and have listened to the applicant’s presentation and any public comment as presented at the hearing, and hereby move to recommend approval of this application based on the findings in the staff report, with the following conditions of approval:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Within 60 days of final approval of the GDP, the applicant shall submit a comprehensive preliminary geotechnical investigation that covers the entire subject property, with sufficient borings and laboratory testing to more accurately characterize subsurface conditions. <p>This motion was then amended and so moved by Ms. Sauve and duly seconded by Mr. Mohrhaus, to amend the first motion to include a second condition stated as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. There needs to be a neighborhood outreach meeting prior to the SDP. <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Howe, Yes; Ms. Latsis, Absent; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Mohrhaus, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Ms. Wolf, Yes.</p>
<p>ITEM 2</p>	<p>CASE NO. SDPZ25-001, 1338 VALENTIA STREET / SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN WITH ZONING (SDPZ) – RAYE FIELDS, PLANNER II; EMILY GONZALEZ, ENGINEER – PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT (PWD)</p> <p>Mr. Hader cited the Land Development Code Chapter 5 - Section 2 notice requirements and stated they had been met; therefore, the PC had jurisdiction to proceed.</p> <p>Ms. Fields stated the applicant and owner, Valentia Street LLC, sought approval to add permitted uses to the existing PUD zoning for the property at 1338 S. Valentia St. She explained the applicant was looking to expand and specify permitted on-site commercial uses with this SDPZ application to include vehicle repair, leasing and rental; veterinary clinics and hospitals; medical and dental clinics; office and retail uses; day care centers and health clubs. She stated the subject property had an existing PUD overlay that permitted certain uses that were not specifically in line with the actual current uses of the property. She concluded based on the review of the applicable policies and goals outlined in the Comp Plan, a review of pertinent zoning regulations, and an analysis of referrals and public comments, that staff was recommending approval of this application.</p>

	<p>Mr. David Spriggs, a member of the owner/ development team, further described the property with an existing 45,000 sq. ft. structure. He said the MU with a PUD overlay had been approved in 1982 (Case No. Z83-02), which permitted uses on the subject property to be “1/3 office/showroom and 2/3 warehouse space,” while past uses of the property had included distribution, warehouse, industrial, manufacturing, specialty trade, and contractor services (electrician, plumber, flooring, etc.) and a dry-cleaning facility. He stated the proposed plan included limitations on these and newly proposed uses to mitigate potential nuisances, such as no outdoor vehicle repair, no overnight animal boarding, and no retail sale of marijuana or cannabis. He stated the plan also expressly prohibited gas stations, vehicle sales, self-storage, nightclubs, marijuana/cannabis dispensaries, and sexually oriented businesses. He added that the applicant proposed to remove the existing non-permitted retention pond on the north side of the property and replace it with a permanent detention pond.</p> <p>Mr. Miller opened the hearing for public comments. There were no members of the public present, and there were no callers. The public hearing was closed.</p> <p>The motion was made by Ms. Sauve and duly seconded by Mr. Mohrhaus, in the case of in SDPZ23-001, 1338 Valentia Street Specific Development Plan with Zoning, I have reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, and have listened to the applicant’s presentation and any public comment as presented at the hearing, and hereby move to recommend approval of this application based on the findings in the staff report.</p> <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Howe, Yes; Ms. Latsis, Absent; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Mohrhaus, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Ms. Wolf, Yes.</p>
<p>ITEM 3</p>	<p>CASE NO. LE25-004, TALL GRASS PARK / LOCATION AND EXTENT (LE) - RAYE FIELDS, PLANNER II; JOSEPH BOATENG, ENGINEER – PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT (PWD)</p> <p>Mr. Hader cited the Land Development Code Chapter 5 - Section 2 notice requirements and stated they had been met; therefore, the PC had jurisdiction to proceed.</p> <p>Ms. Fields stated the applicant, Stream Landscape Architecture, proposed improvements to Tall Grass Park, including two pickleball courts, grading, adding concrete and soft surface trails, a boardwalk, a vault restroom, a picnic area, and revegetation of areas within the park. She said Tall Grass Park was 9.17 acres, located northwest of the corner of S. Picadilly Road. and E. Quincy Avenue, at 21250 E. Oxford</p>

Avenue, owned by Trails Park and Recreation District (TPRD), and was located within the Saddle Rock Highlands Subdivision zoned Mixed Use (MU). She recounted that the park was approved in 2010 through LE10-002 to provide a multi-use play field in the center, playground, picnic shelter, and walking trails. She said an administrative amendment was approved in 2012 (Case No. TA12-103) for the addition of retaining walls. She said the park's hours of operation would be from 5 a.m. to 10 p.m. with unlit pickleball courts located 255 feet from the residential properties to the south, and 290 feet from the residential properties to the west. She concluded based upon review of applicable policies and goals in the Comprehensive Plan, review of the development regulations, and analysis of referral comments, Staff was recommending approval of this application.

Mr. Delos Searle, Executive Director of TRPD, described the landscaped hill to the south of the park as a natural sound barrier. He explained how the additional drainage way, vegetation, and the area around the courts were also being planned. He added there was consideration of sound netting for the courts and posted librarian ball rules for play, along with the lack of lighting, to minimize disturbance to neighbors. He said that there would be a water conservation plan for the existing field area that would remove a portion of the existing grass and revegetation with xeriscaping to conserve water use.

Mr. Miller opened the hearing for public comments. There were two members of the public present who expressed concerns about pickleball noise, after-hours noise, and misuse of the park, and there were no callers. The public hearing was closed.

There was discussion regarding how the Pickle Ball courts relocation addressed noise, confirmation that there would be signage for rules, how the unlit court restricted use to daylight hours, and how the foam Library ball versus the hard plastic traditional ball worked to mitigate noise. Mr. Searle described how TRPD managed enforcement of park hours with visits 2-3 times per week to parks for trash and maintenance but reminded all that this was a small staff managing several parks. He described the safety solar lighting for the playground shelter and indicated vault restrooms would have solar lights on and timed for no after-hours use. He briefly addressed the disc golf course concerns and how they would be addressed with landscaping changes.

The motion was made by Mr. Sall and duly seconded by Ms. Wolf, in the case of LE25-004, Tall Grass Park Location and Extent, I have reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, and have listened to the staff presentation and any public comment as presented at the hearing, and hereby move to approve the proposed Location and Extent as presented in the staff report.

	<p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Howe, Yes; Ms. Latsis, Absent; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Mohrhaus, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Ms. Wolf, Yes.</p>
ANNOUNCEMENTS	<p>Mr. Reynolds announced the May 19th meeting would be hearing the Minor Subdivision for Rattlestitch Ranch and the 1040/LE Power Pathways case, the June 2nd meeting would hear the Box Elder Creek diversion structure and an oil & gas pipeline USR-1041 cases, and the June 16th meeting would hear the Strasburg Sub Area plan.</p> <p>Chair Miller suggested moving the June hearing to Strasburg. Mr. Reynolds reminded all that our call-in feature could also be used by the public, thereby saving the need for a lengthy drive to attend any hearing.</p>
ADJOURNMENT	<p>The meeting was adjourned.</p>