

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 14, 2021**

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; Rodney Brockelman, Randall Miller, Richard Sall and Lynn Sauve. Jane Rieck absent and excused.</p> <p>Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Asst. County Attorney; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Sue Liu, Engineer; Joseph Boateng, Engineer; Diane Kocis, Energy Specialist; Bill Skinner, Senior Planner; Kelsea Dombrowski, Planner II; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager; Kim Lynch, Planning Assistant; and members of the public.</p>
CALL TO ORDER	<p>Chair Latsis called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted a quorum of the Board was present.</p> <p>This meeting was held through the TEAMS platform and telephone call-in for public participation in public hearing items.</p> <p>Mr. Reynolds 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 August 17, 2021, Planning Commission meeting, with corrections.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p>
REGULAR ITEMS:	

<p>ITEM 1</p>	<p>CASE NO LDC19-004, OIL AND GAS / ENERGY REGULATIONS / LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE (LDC) AMENDMENT – Continued from August 17, 2021 – Diane Kocis, Energy Specialist (PWD)</p> <p>Staff requested a continuation of the hearing to October 5, 2021 to allow additional time for coordination between emergency services providers and staff, as well as, an opportunity to post final revisions to the Arapahoe County website for public and stakeholder review.</p> <p>It was moved by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Ms. Sauve, in the case of LDC19-004, Oil and Gas / Energy Regulations / Land Development Code Amendment, to continue the hearing to October 5, 2021, 6:30 p.m. at the same location.</p> <p>The vote was:</p> <p>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 CZ20-002, GUILFORD RANCH / CONVENTIONAL REZONE (CZ) – KELSEA DOMBROVSKI, PLANNER II (PWD)</p> <p>The noticing requirements had been met; therefore, Planning Commission (PC) had jurisdiction to proceed with the hearing.</p> <p>Janice Jensen, representing the Guilfords as owners of the subject property, provided a history of the property ownership. She reported the Guildfords had owned the property for 68 years. She explained that the property acreage had been reduced from 40 acres to the current 38.57 acres when land was donated for ingress/egress. Ms. Jensen stated the Guilfords were requested a rezone to RR-B (Rural Residential) to permit future subdivision of the land to be consistent with adjoining subdivisions to the south and east.</p> <p>Ms. Latsis opened the hearing for public comments.</p> <p>Five different speakers shared testimony. There were concerns over impacts to wildlife and the view, as well as, questions regarding access, water, and the amount of homes proposed to be built on the property and the proposed layout. One neighbor spoke in support of the proposal anticipating the Guilfords would do a good job of developing the area.</p> <p>The public hearing was closed.</p>

Ms. Dombrovski noted some of the characteristics for the RR-B zone district and the development standards. She said they provided a rural feel based on the minimum 2.41-acre lot size. She explained that only the rezoning was being considered at this time. She shared anticipated access points. Ms. Dombrovski reported the arroyo was likely to affect the density and actual lot size as lots were laid out. She explained this was the first public hearing for the rezone; the hearing with the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) on the rezone would be scheduled in 4 to 6 weeks. Ms. Dombrovski said that following the rezone, the subdivision plat would need to go through approval and that process would take several months.

There were continued discussions concerning wells, centralized water, and septic.

Ms. Jensen said the water research had been done and submitted to the State Engineer. She said it was expected that the water would support the estimated 15 lots that could be created. She said, while everyone loved their views, it was not reasonable to ask the Guilfords to not make any changes to their property. She explained that with the lot sizes planned, there would not be a “sea of rooftops.”

There were further discussions regarding setbacks and accessory uses.

It was moved by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Ms. Sauve, in the case of CZ20-002, Guilford Ranch / Conventional Rezoning, 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 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 and SEMSWA Staff comments and concerns.**
- 2. Development of lots within the rezoning area shall meet requirements of the fire code adopted by the fire district, which includes water supply and access.**

The vote was:

Ms. Sauve, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes; Mr. Brockelman, Yes.

Item 3

CASE NO SDPZ21-003, DOVE VALLEY FLEX BUILDING / SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN WITH ZONING (SDPZ) – BILL SKINNER, SENIOR PLANNER (PWD)

The noticing requirements had been met; therefore, Planning Commission (PC) had jurisdiction to proceed with the hearing.

Mr. Skinner introduced the proposal for a zoning-level Specific Development Plan with a Rezone. He noted the site was near the Centennial Airport and near other industrial-type buildings and lots.

Ms. Wollman asked whether any of the other warehouse structures in the area had been granted an exemption of the open space requirement around them. She noted the corner property seemed to have a smaller unobstructed open space.

Mr. Skinner gave some history of the zoning in the area and the open space requirements. He believed there might have been some liberties taken over the years with some of the properties and that would require some review.

John Spencer, on behalf of Dove Valley Flex Space, noted that the land was a corner lot and was surrounded by a number of smaller industrial lots. He explained that the Dove Valley Master Development Plan (MDP) controlled much of the property in the area; however, the property under review was not part of the Dove Valley MDP. Mr. Spencer noted some of the buildings and uses on adjoining properties and buildings. He reported the request was for a 35,000 square-foot flex space that could accommodate multiple uses and users. He said the SDPZ included a chart that identified a number of uses similar to the surrounding developments, including the Dove Valley MDP; he reviewed the list of uses proposed to be accommodated on the property with the SDPZ request. Mr. Spencer said some of the uses would require an additional level of approval, such as a Use by Special Review (USR); however, outdoor storage was requested as part of this zoning for tenants of the building. He reviewed the site plan with respect to location of outdoor storage. He reported that all necessary utilities for water, sewer and storm drainage could be accommodated on the property. He said the land had approximately 15 feet of elevation change across the property; a retaining wall and landscaping would help to address some of the change; one area was a swale due to SEMSWA drainage limitations on landscaping (at the intersection and along Adam Aircraft Drive). Mr. Spencer noted that properties nearby had around 20% on-site open space; a reduction to 18% was being requested because of the grade change and the need for the retaining wall. He reported there

	<p>were development regulations proposed as part of the SDPZ, and conceptual elevations were shown.</p> <p>Ms. Wollman asked about the storage facilities for the tenants. She asked what type of storage it would be and if the storage areas would be visible with the grade on the property.</p> <p>Mr. Spencer said the storage would include lockable Conex-type containers.</p> <p>Mr. Skinner noted a change with the remaining Dove Valley MDP property that allowed additional outdoor storage.</p> <p>Mr. Spencer indicated that there would be some screening provided; however, the containers would be located to the rear of the buildings, and the elevation change would help to conceal them. He said an exception would be in the area with the swale and limitation on landscaping – there may be some visibility for a portion of the storage area from this point. He explained that there was also an access easement across the property shared with another property; that area would also be more visually open. Mr. Spencer reported the movable storage units would be accessory and not a primary use.</p> <p>Ms. Wollman asked whether the architecture was tilt-up concrete panels.</p> <p>Mr. Spencer said that it was.</p> <p>Ms. Latsis asked about fencing used as screening.</p> <p>Mr. Spencer indicated that no fencing was planned and that no permanent structures, such as a fence, were allowed across the airport easement.</p> <p>Ms. Latsis opened the hearing for public comment. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.</p> <p>It was moved by Ms. Sauve and duly seconded by Mr. Miller, in the case of SDPZ21-003, Dove Valley Flex Building / Specific Development Plan with Zoning, that the Planning Commission 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 hereby moved to recommend approval of this 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 and Development Staff comments and concerns. 2. No permits will be issued until the applicant addresses South Metro Fire Protection District concerns. 3. The use listed as “Explosion welding, cladding, or metallurgical bonding of metal or other similar uses” shall be a use by special review. <p>The vote was:</p> <p>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>It was noted that this evening’s meeting was a special meeting of the Planning Commission, rescheduled from September 7, 2021 and that the second meeting of the month was scheduled for next week, September 21, 2021.</p> <p>Kim Lynch, Planning Technician, was introduced to the board.</p> <p>It was noted that as part of the County’s sustainability initiative the Public Works Department had committed to not buying individual disposable water bottles. As a result, staff was given reusable water bottles. Ms. Yeckes asked the board members to please take one for future use.</p>
<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>