

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, JANUARY 21, 2025**

<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	<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.</p> <p>The following Planning Commission members were in attendance: Rodney Brockelman; Brooke Howe; Kathryn Latsis; Randall Miller; Dave Mohrhaus, Chair Pro-Tem; Richard Sall; and Lynn Sauve, Chair.</p> <p>Also, present were Ron Carl, County Attorney; Ava Pecherzewski, Development Review Planning Manager (moderator); Molly Orkild-Larson, Principal Planner; Ernie Rose, Senior Planner; Emily Gonzalez, Engineer (attending by call-in); and Kim Lynch, Planning Technician.</p>
<b>CALL TO ORDER</b>	<p>Ms. Sauve called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and 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>
<b>GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:</b>	
<b>APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES</b>	<p><b>The motion was made by Mr. Mohrhaus and duly seconded by Ms. Latsis to accept the minutes from the <u>January 7, 2025</u> Planning Commission meeting, as submitted.</b></p> <p><b>The vote was:</b></p> <p><b>Mr. Brockelman, Yes; Ms. Howe, Yes; Ms. Latsis, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Mohrhaus, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; and Ms. Sauve, Yes.</b></p>
<b>PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:</b>	
<b>ITEM 1</b>	<p><b>CASE NO. FDP23-001, COPPERLEAF #30 L2B1 [LITTLE SUNSHINE’S PLAYHOUSE &amp; PRESCHOOL] / FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (FDP) – ERNIE ROSE, SENIOR PLANNER; EMILY GONZALEZ, ENGINEER – PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT (PWD)</b></p> <p>Ms. Sauve asked the County Attorney if the PC had jurisdiction to proceed. Mr. Carl said that Case No. FDP23-001, COPPERLEAF #30 L2B1 [LITTLE SUNSHINE’S PLAYHOUSE &amp; PRESCHOOL] had been properly noticed and the PC had jurisdiction to proceed.</p> <p>Mr. Rose said the applicant, Little Sunshine’s Playhouse &amp; Preschool, and property owner, Lennox at Copperleaf, proposed a 10,967 square-foot childcare facility on a 2.03-acre parcel located southwest of the intersection of East Quincy</p>

Avenue on 4401 Copperleaf Boulevard. He described the project as including the construction of two play areas, a 3,910-square-foot playground and a 2,640-square-foot infant playground, associated parking, sidewalks, and landscaping in addition to this facility. He reported the subject property was in Use Area Parcel M of the Copperleaf Preliminary Development Plan (Z13-003) known as a “Town Centre” which required a Use by Special Review (USR) for a daycare facility at this location. He added this property was governed by the Copperleaf Development Agreement, executed in 2005, which required properties in Use Area M to have site plans reviewed by the PC through the FDP process. He explained this meant the PC would make an overall recommendation on this FDP which would then move forward to the Board of County Commissioners for approval.

He said that Section 4-1.2. B.3 of the LDC allowed the applicant to submit a request to reduce parking requirements to the Planning Manager and in this case the applicant was required to provide 44 parking spaces and proposed to provide 42. He stated per the Copperleaf PDP requirement that all parking requirements follow the County Code, as in effect on March 29, 2004, or subsequent parking codes adopted by Arapahoe County, whichever was less stringent, the applicant requested that the County apply the 2019 parking requirements, which required 1 parking space per 250 square feet. He explained that the proposal of 42 parking spaces, a 5.6% parking reduction, met the 2019 LDC requirements. He cited the Copperleaf Towne Centre Design Guidelines (May 24, 2004), which stated that waivers for reducing the parking standard could be sought at the FDP if it was not practical or feasible or may result in a less-than-appropriate design response. He cited the 2019 Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Parking Generation Manual, 5th edition, which stated that the required parking ratio for a daycare use was 3.3 spaces per 10,000 sf, 1.3 spaces per employee, and .021 spaces per student, and the proposed development will have 25 employees and 135 students, resulting in a required 39 parking spaces based on the 2019 ITE manual and this was below the 42 spaces proposed.

He stated Staff had visited the site and reviewed the plans, supporting documentation, referral comments, and citizen input in response to this application and based on the review of applicable policies and goals, as outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, review of the development regulations, and analysis of referral comments, findings included:

1. The proposed Final Development Plan and Use by Special Review generally conformed to the Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan.
2. The proposed Final Development Plan complied with the process and review criteria outlined in Chapter 13-100; Planned Unit Development of the Arapahoe County LDC (adopted January 31, 2011) as was vested under the Development Agreement.
3. The proposed USR met the Arapahoe County LDC, including Section 5.3.4.B.

4. The proposed Final Development Plan substantially conformed with the underlying Copperleaf Preliminary Development Plan and subsequent amendments.

He concluded that, considering these findings, staff recommended approval of the FDP application. He introduced Mr. Brett Roubal of Little Sunshine's who described the business model and other existing properties developed around the country and explained their general site plan for this property. He discussed the successful implementation of similar plans at existing sites. He also introduced Mr. Alpha Barry of K2 Civil who was consulting on the project.

Ms. Sauve opened the hearing for public comments. There were no members of the public present and there were no callers. The public hearing was closed.

There was discussion around the following:

- Shade features and materials used in their construction.
- Grading and detention pond proposed.
- Safety in the event of an emergency such as a fire.
- Was Little Sunshine's a privately held company?

Mr. Roubal described the play and shade structures as made of wood and some plastic (slide features) and how shading at existing sites was minimal but adequate and did not result in ultra sun-heated equipment due to their design. Mr. Barry of K2 Civil reported the proposed grading pattern aligned with regulations and regional detention pond was included. Mr. Barry said there were multiple points of building access in spite of there being only one access road to the entrance of the building. He showed the location of appropriate fire suppression hydrants on the property. Mr. Rose explained the plans were reviewed by South Metro Fire District and stated they had approved this access and parking lot design. Mr. Barry discussed that in an emergency situation where parking access was blocked, parents could be instructed to use perimeter parking available at neighboring properties to the east and north. Mr. Roubal noted that his company was privately held and described the mission of the daycare facilities in depth. He reported his company encouraged local management teams and leadership staff to go out and meet neighbors, local business associations, other businesses nearby to promote culture of community. He said they had developed a Montessori-type model for smaller children that was designed to give time for kids to grow without technology up to end of preschool age.

**The motion was made by Mr. Mohrhaus and duly seconded by Ms. Howe, in the case of FDP23-001, Little Sunshine's Playhouse and Preschool Final Development Plan, the Planning Commission, 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, subject to the following conditions:**

	<p><b>1. Before signing the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address the Public Works and Development staff's comments and concerns.</b></p> <p><b>2. The applicant shall meet all of East Cherry Creek Valley and Water Sanitation requirements.</b></p> <p><b>3. The applicant must meet all of Arapahoe County Health Department requirements and receive approval from this Department prior to construction.</b></p> <p><b>The vote was:</b></p> <p><b>Mr. Brockelman, Yes; Ms. Howe, Yes; Ms. Latsis, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Mohrhaus, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes.</b></p>
<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS</b>	<p>Ms. Orkild-Larson announced there would be one procedural housekeeping hearing item and one study session on Engineering Traffic Studies for the Planning Commission meeting upcoming on February 4<sup>th</sup>.</p>
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>