

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
 ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
 TUESDAY, JULY 19, 2022**

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.</p> <p>The following Planning Commission members were in attendance: Kathryn Latsis, Randall Miller, Chair Pro-Tem; Jane Rieck, Richard Sall; Lynn Sauve; and Jamie Wollman, Chair.</p> <p>Also present were Robert Hill, Senior Assistant County Attorney; Jason Reynolds, Planning Division Manager (moderator); Ava Pecherzewski, Development Review Planning Manager; Robert Victor, Engineering Services Program Manager; Kat Hammer, Senior Planner; Loretta Daniel, Long Range Planning Manager; Gretchen Ricehill, Long Range Planner; Larry Mugler, Long Range Planner, members of the applicant's team and 3 members of the public.</p>
CALL TO ORDER	<p>Ms. Wollman 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 public.</p>
GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:	
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES	<p>The motion was made by Ms. Rieck and duly seconded by Ms. Latsis to accept the minutes from the June 7, 2022 Planning Commission meeting, as submitted:</p> <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Latsis, Yes; Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes; Mr. Brockelman, Absent.</p>
PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:	
ITEM 1	<p>CASE NO FDP21-005, COPPERLEAF #30 [CALIBER AT COPPERLEAF] / FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN (FDP) – PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT – KAT HAMMER, SENIOR PLANNER; EMILY GONZALEZ, ENGINEER</p>

	<p>Ms. Hammer stated the case had been properly noticed and that the Planning Commission (PC) had jurisdiction to proceed. She presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. She reported that The Garret Companies, LLC, on the behalf of the owner, Copperleaf Senior Living, LLC, was proposing 175 multi-family dwelling units in two residential buildings, one model unit, three internal courtyards, a dog park, a clubhouse and pool and included nine attached garages and 36 detached garages for rent. Ms. Hammer stated sidewalks were proposed along East Quincy Avenue and Copperleaf Boulevard. She explained that the proposal required the applicant to dedicate additional right-of-way for a deceleration lane into the site from Copperleaf Boulevard. She said the dedication would occur if the associated Final Plat application was approved by the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) at the August 9, 2022 business meeting. Ms. Hammer reported that the proposal required 356 parking spaces. She said the Land Development Code (LDC) permitted the Planning Division Manager to allow a 10% parking reduction through an administrative land use process. She further explained that the applicant was requesting approval for a 9.2% reduction from the required parking standards and had provided a letter indicating the reasoning behind the request and also included a comparison of parking requirements from other jurisdictions. She stated the applicant's proposed ratio of 1.75 spaces per unit provided significantly more parking than the Institute of Transportation Engineers Parking Generation Manual, 5th Edition estimate of 1.31 spaces per unit needed. Ms. Hammer concluded that staff supported the project with the parking reduction request.</p> <p>The applicant, Rachel Harmon of The Garrett Companies, LLC, stated that the company currently had no plans to start construction. She described the design plan for graduated building heights between the two proposed buildings to provide transition from single family to multi-family areas. She explained there would be a maximum separation area between the fence and buildings of 125 feet when only 25 feet of setback was required. She reported there would also be additional buffering from the detached garages on the edge of the development to the south. She explained the development included resort-style amenities and that the higher-end community was planned for families. She added that background checks would be required for residents.</p> <p>There were discussions regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was multi-family an approved use in the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP)? What other uses would have been allowed under the PDP? • Why was there confusion on the part of current residents about proposed uses for the site?
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why were changes made to the number of residential units? • What was the existing fence size and material? • What was the increase in the number of daily car trips as a result of the development? <p>Ms. Hammer confirmed that multi-family was an approved use in the PDP. She explained that daycare and other commercial uses would have been allowed under the PDP to service people in a close vicinity to the site. She said there had been some promotional material circulated by builders in the area that erroneously showed residential in areas zoned for mixed-use and this had resulted in confusion about proposed uses for this and other sites in Copperleaf.</p> <p>Ms. Harmon explained that projects on the other side of Copperleaf Boulevard had been proposed for 1320 units at the same time as the project the PC was considering today. She said the number of buildings for the project had been reduced from three to two to comply with the maximum number of allowed units. She said that a past plan had been circulated in the area to residents that described a park in the area, but no land had been dedicated in the PDP for future parks. She stated that, to her knowledge, the site was not intended for commercial use and information had been miscommunicated. She remarked that an additional 2 acres of land had been set aside for non-residential use and would be presented to area residents in the near future. Ms. Harmon explained that the existing wood fence was 6 feet tall and that had prompted increased space and landscaping to be added to the design for privacy.</p> <p>Brian Horan of Galloway Consulting, stated that the maximum number of trips added because of the project would be 800 which was less than usual. He discussed the Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and explained the deceleration improvements to the right turn lane into the development had been included to address traffic congestion. He said this was done in development collaboration with traffic engineers of neighboring developments to accommodate this and other concerns raised in the study.</p> <p>Ms. Wollman opened the hearing for public comments. There were 3 members of the public present, two of whom spoke. All were opposed for reasons of the potential for increased crime, traffic congestion and perceived school overcrowding. The public hearing was closed.</p> <p>The motion was made by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Mr. Sall, in the case of FDP21-005, Copperleaf #30 Final Development Plan, that the PC reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, have listened to the applicant's presentation and any public comment as presented</p>
--	--

	<p>at the hearing, and moved to recommend approval of 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 the plans the applicant must address Public Works and Development Staff comments and concerns. 2. Approval is contingent upon Board of County Commissioner's approval of the associated Final Plat application, Case No. PF21-007. 3. The applicant shall submit a letter of no objection from East Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District prior to the signature of the associated Final Plat. <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Latsis, Yes; Ms. Rieck, No; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Mr. Miller, No; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes; Mr. Brockelman, Absent.</p>
	<p>CASE NO. LR22-002 – ARAPAHOE COUNTY 2018 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT – AMENDMENT OF THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY 2018 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO CORRECT ERRORS AND OMISSIONS - PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT - LORETTA DANIEL, LONG RANGE PLANNING PROGRAM MANAGER; LARRY MUGLER, PROJECT SPECIALIST; GRETCHEN RICEHILL, PROJECT SPECIALIST</p> <p>Ms. Daniel stated that the case had been properly noticed and that the Planning Commission (PC) had jurisdiction to proceed. She presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. She explained that Arapahoe County proposed to amend the 2018 Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan to correct certain errors and omissions, in particular, correcting various mapping errors; updating the text by incorporating various approved County plans that had been adopted after 2018; clarifying the descriptions of land use categories and the Comprehensive Plan amendment process, and for the removal, addition, and/or expanded definitions. She stated this hearing would be the first of two, regularly-scheduled annual hearings to consider text and mapping updates. Ms. Daniel described the Comprehensive Plan as the County's official public document that guided land use, growth, and development decisions. She further explained that because it was a long-range document that plans twenty years into the future, to remain relevant, the Plan should be regularly reviewed and updated so that its vision, goals, policies, and strategies continued to be an effective tool to direct policy and land use decisions. She concluded that staff recommended approval of the changes described in the attached presentation.</p>

	<p>Mr. Mugler described the requirements and policies for Open Spaces that would be clarified and added. He explained that the Hazard Mitigation plan policies were good, but the wording needed to be updated to new language in the document as was the case with other sections like the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. He said the Glossary would remain in the main body of the text but would be removed from the appendix.</p> <p>Ms. Daniel discussed the changes to Chapter 3-Land Use and described the updates to more modern terminologies that would added. She stated changes to the Density section from 12-16 would be expanded with 5 criteria with the intent to better explain infill development. She said that multi-family had been expanded to include duplexes.</p> <p>Ms. Ricehill demonstrated the Mapping Corrections to several amendments of the Urban Area Land Use Plan map. She explained the amendments were done to align with approved Copperleaf PDP zoning. She discussed the map areas A-O and stated the Plan Map should have been updated at the time these were approved but would be updated now.</p> <p>Ms. Wollman opened the hearing for public comments. There were no members of the public or callers with comments. The public hearing was closed.</p> <p>The motion was made by Mr. Miller and duly seconded by Ms. Sauve, in the case of LR22-002, Amendment of the 2018 Comprehensive Plan to correct certain errors and omissions, that the Planning Commission read the staff report and received testimony at the public hearing and moved to approve the Comprehensive Plan Amendment to update goals, policies, and strategies by incorporating various approved County plans that had been adopted since 2018; to clarify descriptions of land use categories; to update the Comprehensive Plan amendment procedures which reflected current practice; to remove, add, and clarify definitions; and, to correct errors in Map 3, the Urban Area Land Use Plan by matching the future land use designation to existing approved and developed land uses, based on findings one and two, and the analysis of the staff report.</p> <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Latsis, Yes; Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes; Mr. Brockelman, Absent.</p>
--	--



ANNOUNCEMENTS	Mr. Reynolds introduced the Planning Division's newest member, Ava Pecherzewski, Development Review Planning Manager.
ADJOURNMENT	There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.