

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2026**

<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 (LDC).</p> <p>The following Planning Commission members were in attendance: Kathryn Latsis, Chair Pro-Tem; Randall Miller; Brooke Moore; Dave Mohrhaus, Chair; Richard Sall; and Lynn Sauve.</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; Sue Liu, Engineer III; Joseph Boateng, Engineer III; and Kim Lynch, Planning Technician.</p>
<b>CALL TO ORDER</b>	<p>Mr. Mohrhaus 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>
<b>GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:</b>	
<b>APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES</b>	<p><b>The motion was made by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Mr. Miller to approve the minutes of the January 20, 2026, Planning Commission meeting, as submitted:</b></p> <p><b>The ayes prevailed, and minutes were approved.</b></p>
<b>PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:</b>	
<b>ITEM 1</b>	<p><b>CASE NO. SDP25-001, SKY RANCH [PLANNING AREAS A1-A9, C4 &amp; D1-D7] / SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN (SDP) – KAT HAMMER, SENIOR PLANNER; SUE LIU, ENGINEER III– PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT (PWD)</b></p> <p>Mr. Hader stated the record contained evidence that the LDC Chapter 5 - Section 2 requirements had been met; therefore, the PC had jurisdiction to proceed.</p> <p>Ms. Hammer said the applicant and owner, PCY Holdings LLC, was requesting approval of a second SDP Major Amendment application to</p>

change the land use designation for planning area A4 (within Neighborhood A) from Single-Family 2 (SF2) to Single-Family 1 (SF1) which would allow smaller lots and smaller lot widths for Sky Ranch Filing No. 9. She reported the Final Plat for Sky Ranch Filing No. 9 proposes 146 single-family detached units and was currently under review by PWD staff, as well as an associated Administrative Site Plan (ASP25-002). She stated this application proposed expansion of planning area A5 by approximately 0.2 acres to accommodate a future garage facility associated with the existing water tank facility for the operator, Rangeview Metropolitan District. She explained approval of a Location and Extent application would be forthcoming for this proposed facility. She described how this amendment to the SDP represented an improvement in quality over the strict application of the applicable zone district by providing alternative and less expensive townhome options to buyers. She said staff had analyzed the application with respect to the Comp Plan, LDC regulations, and all referral comments received, and staff recommended approval of this Specific Development Plan Major Amendment.

Mr. Mark Harding, of PCY Holdings, thanked staff for all their hard work on the Sky Ranch development overall. He confirmed the change proposed to the remaining development area to align with providing duplex units which added more density to the area without the impacts of traditional high-density development. He confirmed that other developed areas in Sky Ranch had seen success with the pricing and sales of this proposed more affordable housing option offering for buyers, and this further strengthened this application.

Mr. Mohrhaus opened the hearing for public comments. There were no members of the public present, and there were no callers who wished to speak. The public hearing was closed.

**The motion was made by Ms. Sauve and duly seconded by Mr. Miller, in the case of SDP25-001 Sky Ranch A1-A9, C4, and D1-D7 – Specific Development Plan Major Amendment, 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 approve this application based on the findings in the staff report.**

**The vote was:**

**Ms. Howe, Yes; Ms. Latsis, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Mohrhaus, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes.**

**ITEM 2**

**CASE NO. CZ25-002, MOUNTAIN VIEW GARDENS T12 [THE TREE FARM] / CONVENTIONAL REZONE (CZ) – KAT HAMMER, SENIOR PLANNER; JOSEPH BOATENG, ENGINEER III – PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT (PWD)**

Commissioner Latsis recused herself from hearing this application due to her business relationship with the case.

Mr. Hader cited the Land Development Code Chapter 5 - Section 2 requirements and stated they had been met; therefore, the PC had jurisdiction to proceed.

Ms. Hammer stated the applicant and owner, Latsis Custom Homes, was requesting a positive recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) for a Conventional Rezone application from Rural Residential-B (RR-B) to Residential 1-C (R-1-C) to allow for the development of four lots for four single-family residences. She reported that staff were concurrently reviewing Minor Subdivision, Case No. PM26-001 and approval of this application was required for further review of this plat. She described the property as part of Tract 12 of Mountain View Gardens Subdivision, which was platted in 1924, where no portion of Tract 12 was ever subdivided; the entirety of Tract 12 was partitioned by six separate deeds. She explained the 2.38-acre parcel had previously functioned as a tree farm and horse pasture and was currently undeveloped and vacant. She outlined the applicant's plan to rezone to R-1-C to develop four lots for single-family residences with lot sizes ranging from 18,055 to 22,254 square feet. She affirmed the R-1-C zone change request was aligned with the higher densities in the Four Square Mile Sub-Area Plan and zoning of neighboring properties. She stated staff reviewed the plans, supporting documentation, and referral comments with respect to the applicable policies and goals in the Comprehensive Plan, the LDC Zoning regulations, and analysis of referral comments and had found them to be aligned, therefore staff recommended a positive recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners of this application.

Mr. Jim Latsis, owner/developer of Latsis Custom Homes, stated the major goal of the proposed development of these 2.3-acre lots was to locate them in such a way as to preserve as many of the healthy mature trees as possible. He explained the setbacks and impervious surface of roadways proposed were designed with modifications and improvements included for the area. He spoke to the issues raised by the Colorado Geologic Survey (CGS) with respect to collapsible soils. He described his soil engineer's findings conflicted with CGS's findings and suggested recommendations for setbacks.

Mr. Edward Ford, Soil Engineer, who called in, said his findings answered the CGS's findings, and the proposed 50-foot setbacks from the creek would more than adequately meet the requirement for safety.

Mr. Mohrhaus opened the hearing for public comments. There were two members of the public present, neither of whom wished to speak, and there were no callers. The public hearing was closed.

	<p><b>The motion was made by Mr. Miller and duly seconded by Mr. Sall, in the case of CZ25-002 Mountain View Gardens T12 – Conventional Rezone to R-1-C, 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.</b></p> <p><b>The vote was:</b></p> <p><b>Ms. Howe, Yes; Ms. Latsis, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Mohrhaus, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes.</b></p>
<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS</b>	<p>Mr. Reynolds announced that the BOCC had appointed a new member of the Planning Commission who would hopefully join this Board for the next PC meeting.</p>
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	<p>The meeting was adjourned.</p>