

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 2022**

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>Kathryn Latsis, Chair; Jamie Wollman, Chair Pro-Tem (participated by phone); Rodney Brockelman, Randall Miller (participated by phone), Jane Rieck, Richard Sall; and Lynn Sauve (participated by phone).</p> <p>Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Asst. County Attorney (participated by phone); Jason Reynolds, Interim Planning Division Manager and Current Planning Program Manager (participated by phone); Molly Orkild-Larson, Principal Planner; Bill Skinner, Senior Planner; Kim Lynch, Planning Technician, and members of the public.</p>
CALL TO ORDER	<p>Ms. Latsis called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted all members of the Board were present.</p> <p>This meeting was held in person and through the Granicus Live Manager platform with telephone call-in for Planning Commission members and for public participation.</p> <p>Ms. Latsis explained the format of the meeting and how the public could provide public comment.</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 14, 2021 Planning Commission meeting, with two changes to page 2. The 1st to replace the colon with a period at the end of paragraph 3 Item 1 and the second to the wording of paragraph 5 to read Mr. Harding stated “that a” instead of Mr. Harding “o”.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p>

<p>APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES</p>	<p>The motion was then made by Ms. Rieck and duly seconded by Mr. Brockelman to accept the minutes from the January 4, 2022 Planning Commission meeting, as submitted.</p> <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Sall, Abstain; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes, Mr. Brockelman, Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">REGULAR ITEMS:</p>	
<p>ITEM 1</p>	<p>CASE NO SDP21-003, DOVE VALLEY BUSINESS PARK #25 / B1L2 / [CASTLE BRAE FLEX] / SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN (SDP); MOLLY ORKILD-LARSON, PRINCIPAL PLANNER; SARAH L WHITE, ENGINEER – PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT (PWD)</p> <p>Ms. Orkild-Larson stated the case had been properly noticed; therefore, the Planning Commission (PC) had jurisdiction to proceed. She provided a summary of the proposed project before introducing the applicant's representative Casey Adragna, Principal of Adragna Architecture and Development. She reported the applicant requested approval of the Castle Brae Flex / Specific Development Plan (SDP). She stated the application proposed a 10,080 site square foot building on Block 1, Lot 2 of the Dove Valley Business Park Subdivision Filing No. 25 located at the southwest corner of E Broncos Parkway and S Potomac Street. Ms. Orkild-Larson said the parcel was situated in Commissioner District No. 2 and zoned Mixed Use (MU). She explained that the building was to have two tenants with each unit being approximately 5,000 square feet. She said the building would be used for office and warehouse space. She reported that staff recommended approval.</p> <p>Casey Adragna, Principal of Adragna Architecture and Development, provided more specific details of various development, landscape, building design, and access aspects of the project.</p> <p>Ms. Wollman asked who would be the targeted tenants.</p>

	<p>Mr. Adragna responded that medium-sized construction tenants such as the proposed contractor, Kahn Construction, would likely take half of the available space.</p> <p>Ms. Latsis opened the hearing for public comments. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.</p> <p>It was moved by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Mr. Brockelman, in the case of SDP21-003, Castle Brae Flex / Specific Development Plan, that the Planning Commissioners reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, have 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 develop a Pest Control Plan for the Administrative Site Plan. This plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Tri-County Health Department. 3. The applicant shall file and receive approval of FAA Form 7460-1 at the time of building permit, if deemed necessary by the FAA. 4. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant shall add the two existing electric boxes to the plans, as requested by Xcel Energy. <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>ITEM 2</p>	<p>CASE NO FDP21-002, COPPERLEAF #27 / FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (FDP) - BILL SKINNER, SENIOR PLANNER; EMILY GONZALEZ, ENGINEER - PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT (PWD)</p> <p>Mr. Skinner stated the case had been properly noticed; therefore, the Planning Commission (PC) had jurisdiction to proceed. He provided a summary of the proposed project before introducing the applicant's representative. He reported the FDP proposed 110 paired homes on the southernmost 11.87 acres of Copperleaf Parcel M-4 at a density of 9.27 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). He stated that all homes had a rear-loaded two-car garage and the lots were typically</p>

either 28'x80' or 28'x92'. Mr. Skinner reported the deeper lots accommodated additional driveway parking to the rear of the home. He said the homes were arranged to front onto public roads, common open spaces, or private park space. He stated Staff recommended approval.

Samantha Pollmiller, Norris Design, presented on behalf of the applicant, Richmond American Homes. She provided specific details of various development, landscape, building design, and pedestrian access aspects of the project. She described a design that included a 0.67 acre park located on the west side of the development adjacent to Copperleaf Boulevard. She reported the park elements included walking paths, benches, trash receptacles, a multi-use turf area, and a play structure designed to accommodate children ages 5-12. Ms. Pollmiller explained that east/west pedestrian connectivity was provided on paved walks along the north and south side of the neighborhood and sidewalks along the internal roadway and a north/south corridor that bisected the relatively long east/west blocks, which would provide north and south pedestrian connections through the site. She stated the proposed internal trail systems connected residents to the larger regional trail corridor, as well as, to activity centers suggested by the Copperleaf PDP on the north end of the Copperleaf M-4 Towne Centre parcel. Ms. Pollmiller added that there was 28.6% Open Space with pedestrian connectivity to existing trails to the W, E, and S edges of the property, which was in excess of the 20% required open space. She explained that the paired-home product were similar to other Richmond developments in the area that were currently priced in the upper \$300,000 range. She stated the project complied with the overarching codes and masterplans and was consistent with the current Mixed Use PUD zoning and the larger vision for Copperleaf Town Center. She indicated the Copperleaf Development team was present and offered to answer any questions the PC might have.

Ms. Rieck inquired as to the difference between Cityscape and this development.

Ms. Pollmiller described the project as an urban paired-home product; whereas, Cityscape was single-family detached three-story homes with alley loaded garages.

Ms. Rieck inquired if the elevations would provide enough variation.

Ms. Pollmiller described the elevations and porch-view orientation as sufficiently variable to create a pleasing urban aesthetic.

Ms. Rieck also inquired about the setback of the property from E-470.

Ms. Pollmiller replied that there was a public trail easement, as well as, some grading that would provide a buffer from traffic noise.

Ms. Wollman asked if the majority of guest parking was located on E Tufts and S Versailles Streets.

Ms. Pollmiller described the garage plus driveway spaces for some residents, as well as, the additional spaces in alleys and on private streets within the property as providing up to 2 additional spaces for those without drives.

Ms. Wollman asked about consistency in the distance between paired homes.

Ms. Pollmiller stated that there were relatively uniform side setbacks (5ft side) with a little more space for those at the alley and mid-block crossings, but overall setbacks were fairly consistent.

Ms. Sauve posed a question for Mr. Skinner regarding maximum building height, due to the generous ceiling heights of the units and wondered if they met the requirement.

Mr. Skinner replied he was unable to find a specification for a maximum height for the town center property, but had used the surrounding existing development to recommend a compatible building height for the project.

Ms. Latsis asked if sustainability and water conservation measures were included in the building designs.

Jason Pock of Richmond Homes explained that higher density led to more sustainable conservation of water in urban areas. He explained the proposed landscaping measures would also allow for home integrity by using drip irrigated shrubs and trees around the homes. He reported that solar ready homes and electric charging stations were also included as sustainable measures in the design. He remarked that noise mitigation was also integrated in the homes in the form of STC 30 windows that were higher quality and provided better noise buffers.

Ms. Latsis opened the hearing for public comments.

Mike Lingolia, resident at 22686 E Chenango Ave, asked what was proposed for schools as Mountain View was already at capacity.

Ms. Pollmiller responded that Cherry Creek Schools was a referral for the project and the school districts, including Sky Ridge and Mountain View, had indicated they had the capacity to serve the additional students.

Mr. Lingolia then inquired about the HOA participation for the new residents and how they would impact the already crowded pools available to the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Pock explained that the homes would be part of the Master Association and subject to the same rules. He stated they would however, be part of a sub association that would be assessed higher fees.

Ms. Pollmiller added that the upcoming higher density projects in Filings 28 and 29 would not be part of the Master Association and, therefore, not a part of the community pool. She explained they would have a pool of their own.

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

It was moved by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Mr. Brockelman , in the case of FDP21-002, Copperleaf No. 27 / Final Development Plan, that the Planning Commissioners 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 moved to recommend approval of the application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns.**
- 2. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant will provide evidence of a finalized agreement with the E-470 Authority that accommodates impacts or encroachments onto E-470 property required by the installation of facilities supporting Copperleaf Filing No. 27 development application FDP21-002.No. 27 development application FDP21-002.**

	<p>3. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans the applicant must provide a letter from the South Metro Fire District stating that SMFD comments and concerns have been addressed.</p> <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>Ms. Orkild-Larson announced that it was her pleasure to be working as a liaison to the Planning Commission on a regular basis.</p>
<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>