

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 2023**

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: Rodney Brockelman; Kathryn Latsis; Randall Miller, Chair; Dave Mohrhaus; Richard Sall; Lynn Sauve, Chair Pro Tem; and Jamie Wollman.</p> <p>Also present were Robert Hill, Senior Assistant County Attorney; Jason Reynolds, Planning Division Manager; Ava Pecherzewski, Development Review Planning Manager (moderator); Molly Orkild-Larson, Principal Planner; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Kat Hammer, Senior Planner; Sue Liu, Engineer; James Beall, CIP Project Manager; Cathy Valencia, CIP Program Manager, and Kim Lynch, Planning Technician.</p>
CALL TO ORDER	<p>Mr. Miller 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. Sauve and duly seconded by Ms. Wollman to postpone or continue approving the minutes from the May 16, 2023 Planning Commission meeting, so that additional notation can be made about the discussion and reasons for PC recommendations made.</p> <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Mr. Brockelman, Yes; Ms. Latsis, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Mohrhaus, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.</p>
PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:	
ITEM 1	<p>CASE NO LE22-004, EAST CHERRY CREEK VALLEY WATER & SANITATION DISTRICT OFFICE EXPANSION / LOCATION AND EXTENT (LE) – KATHLEEN HAMMER, SENIOR PLANNER AND SUE LIU, ENGINEER – PUBLIC WORKS & DEVELOPMENT (PWD)</p>

Ms. Hammer stated the case had been properly noticed and the PC had jurisdiction to proceed. She reported the applicant and property owner, East Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District (ECCV) was requesting approval of a Location and Extent Amendment to modify an existing wireless facility. She said the modification consisted of extending the existing tower height by 20 feet, from 40 feet to 60 feet, to increase transmission signals and improve service to the surrounding area. She described the proposed maximum height of the antenna as 71 feet and 6 inches. She added there were no proposed changes to the ground lease area. She said the maximum height for this site was set in the approved Huntington-Smoky Hill Preliminary Development Plan, (PDP), Z99-010. She described how the PDP identified this site as Park/Public Use but the development standards did not include a maximum height for public use areas. She stated the site was located near the intersection of East Smoky Hill Road and South Gun Club Road. She affirmed the ECCV had purchased the property in 1979 and built a five million gallon reservoir during the 1980s. She recounted how the LE plan was approved in 1991 (L91-006) that allowed the construction of the 2,000 square foot shop building on the property. She said the first amendment was approved in 1997 (A97-016) and allowed the placement and location of a Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS) on the site. She went on to say the second amendment, approved in 1997 (A97-039) allowed the construction of the 10 million gallon reservoir tanks. She added the third amendment, (L00-004) allowed for a booster pump station, transformer and asphalt drive and the deletion of the secondary access to East Smoky Hill Road. She described how Amendments four through six (A00-49, L03-013, L03-002 and A05-013) allowed for modifications to monopoles on-site and the expansion of the existing shop building. She said the seventh amendment (L07-001) allowed for the addition of the disinfection station and storage bay, and relocation of existing antennas. She added the eighth amendment (A09-005) changed the existing 2,075 square foot shop building to office use, added seven new parking spaces, modified parking spaces and modified the building façade. She stated the Planning Commission approved LE18-007 on August 6, 2019 that approved an office expansion of the existing facility, improved parking and vehicular circulation and access.

There were discussions regarding the following:

- How were neighboring property owners notified of the application?
- How many were notified?
- Were any landscaping requirements proposed?

Ms. Hammer described how staff assisted the applicant in identifying the 500 foot radius where they would be required to mail a packet of information regarding the proposal and provide an email address where any comments could be gathered. She affirmed there were no responses received. She concluded that there were no landscaping changes proposed in this application.

	<p>Mr. Charlie Aigello, Castle Rock Microwave, spoke in support of the project. He confirmed that 44 property owners received the notification mailing described by Ms. Hammer. He stated that the overall height would be 71.5 feet including the antennas.</p> <p>There was discussion regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the purpose of the extension of the tower to increase wireless functionality? And was any co-location planned for these? • How would this look compared to what exists there now? <p>Mr. Aigello stated this extension was intended strictly for ECCV business purposes. He indicated that no co-location of other wireless providers was planned on this tower. He showed a photo of how the tower looked today and compared this with a rendering of how the tower would look after extension.</p> <p>Mr. Miller opened public hearing. There were no public comments and no callers on the line. The public hearing was closed.</p> <p>The motion was made by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Mr. Mohrhaus, in the case of LE22-004, East Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District Office Expansion Location and Extent 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, subject to the following condition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans the applicant must address Public Works and Development Staff comments and concerns. <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Mr. Brockelman, Yes; Ms. Latsis, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Mohrhaus, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.</p>
--	--

STUDY SESSION ITEMS:

ITEM 1	COMANCHE / WOLF CREEK DRAINAGE STUDY / STUDY SESSION – JAMES BEALL, ENGINEER II AND CATHLEEN VALENCIA, CIP PROGRAM MANAGER – PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT (PWD)
---------------	--

Ms. Rifka Wine of Bohannon Huston, Inc. and Mr. Beall, ArapCo Capital Improvements Program Project Manager presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record.

Mr. Beall explained that PWD had facilitated master drainage studies in Unincorporated Arapahoe County over the past few years. He described how each study was intended to research each respective creek, their tributaries, and their overall impact on existing development, Arapahoe County owned assets, and future development. He said PWD had started in the central portion of Arapahoe County and was progressing easterly with each study. He added the Kiowa Creek Master Drainage Plan (C15-006) was completed by Bohannon Huston, Inc (BHI) in 2017. He said the Wolf Creek Master Drainage Plan was completed by BHI in 2019. He reported BHI's contract was extended to include Comanche Creek and Little Comanche Creek Master Drainage Study between 2021 and 2023. He characterized how both Wolf Creek and Comanche Creek run north-south through Arapahoe County and occupy watersheds in both Elbert County to the south and Adams County to the north. He described how Wolf Creek runs about two miles east of Strasburg while Comanche Creek runs on the east side of the center of Strasburg. He illustrated how Wolf Creek measures about 84 square miles of total watershed area (37 square miles within Arapahoe County) while Comanche Creek and Little Comanche Creek covered approximately 101 square miles of watershed area (of which only 32 square miles are within Arapahoe County).

Ms. Rifka expounded on how each study identified key sets of information such as:

- The overall study captured total land area of each watershed and tributary including the 100 year floodplain.
- Descriptions of each land use and associated attributes.
- Flood history, flood risk (based on current installed infrastructure) and flooding impacts.
- Each tributary's channel slopes, vegetation condition, and preservation recommendations.
- Environmental assessment information was gathered related to biological and organic (vegetative) conditions throughout the drainage way.
- Hydrologic and hydraulic analysis of existing infrastructure modelling each Reach of both Comanche Creek, Little Comanche Creek and Wolf Creek.
- Alternate analysis by modifying design criteria and constraints to create a well-rounded overall analysis of Comanche Creek and Little Comanche Creek.

She reported that BHI wrapped-up the study by offering recommendations based off a weighted evaluation matrix. She stated these recommendations included conceptualized designs at each significant reference point along the

	<p>respective creeks. She explained how the study team also facilitated public outreach efforts. She recounted how multiple forms included individual correspondence with property owners, mailed flyers and post cards, the use social media, and hosted an in-person, open-house style public meeting at the Arapahoe County Eastern Service Center.</p> <p>There were discussions regarding the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What determined the different recommendations specific to a bridge v. Box culvert decision? • Was any federal funding available for recommended mitigation to plan for 100 year flood events and known problem areas? • Was perk soil testing done? • Were Comp Plan Maps used in the analyses and how were budgets determined? <p>Mr. Beall responded that traffic volumes, project cost, and structure criteria determined the recommendation where a bridge or a box culvert might be installed. He cited the Jolly Road bridge project as a recent example. He said that ArapaCo had provided a match for Jolly Road bridge federal funding. He recounted that the PWD director and CIP Division Manager actively and regularly pursued those funds. He said that private land was where these studies were focused so minimal soil testing had been done and those done were not representative of where flooding would likely occur on these private properties.</p> <p>Ms. Wine said BHI had only proposed very high level budgets that used planning level order of magnitude estimates that included rising constructions costs in the model.</p>
ANNOUNCEMENTS	<p>Ms. Orkild-Larson confirmed there would be a Planning Commission hearing on June 20, 2023 regarding Storage Containers and the meeting on July 11, 2023 would have a hearing for a restaurant to be located at E. Quincy Avenue and Picadilly Road, within the Tallgrass development.</p>
ADJOURNMENT	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>