

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, AUGUST 2, 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: Rodney Brockelman, 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; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Molly Orkild-Larson, Principal Planner; Joseph Boateng, Engineer; members of the applicants' teams 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. Latsis and duly seconded by Mr. Miller to accept the minutes from the July 19, 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, Yes.</p>
PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:	
ITEM 1	<p>CASE NO PM22-001, TIEDEMAN SUBDIVISION / MINOR SUBDIVISION (PM) – PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT - MOLLY ORKILD-LARSON, PRINCIPAL PLANNER; JOSEPH BOATENG, ENGINEER</p> <p>Ms. Orkild-Larson stated the case had been properly noticed and that the PC had jurisdiction to proceed. She presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. She reported the owner applicant, Debbie Bakarich, was seeking approval to combine Parcels 6 and 7 and re-subdivide</p>

them into three lots ranging in size from 20 to 25 acres as described in the presentation slides. She explained the staff had received an email from a neighbor who had concerns about adding another home to the area and water source and supply issues. Ms. Orkild-Larson presented this email for the record. She reported the state water engineer did review the proposal and they indicated there was sufficient water. She concluded that staff recommended the application be approved based on the findings and with conditions of approval.

There were discussions regarding the following questions:

- Were these lots vacant?
- What was the history of the established neighborhood?

Ms. Orkild-Larson replied that the subject properties had houses. She explained the neighborhood was established in 2003 with lots greater than 35 acres, most of which had homes built on them.

Ms. Wollman opened the hearing for public comments.

There was one member of the public present, who was opposed for reasons of stressed water resources in the area and the concern this subdivision would encourage others to subdivide their parcels. The owners of the subject properties, Debbie Bakarich and David Tiedeman, responded they had hired a water attorney who had done an in-depth investigation and had then gone to the water board to share the finding that this project would not affect others.

The public hearing was closed.

The motion was made by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Ms. Sauve, in the case of PM22-001, Tiedeman Minor Subdivision, the PC has reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments and has listened to the applicant's presentation and the public comment as presented at the hearing and hereby move to recommend approval of this 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 will address all Public Works and Development Staff comments.**
- 2. Prior to recording the final mylar, the applicant shall pay a total cash-in-lieu fee of \$2,449.09. This cash-in-lieu fee shall be distributed as follows: Bennett School District: \$2,079.09; Public Parks: \$355.20; and Other Public Purposes: \$14.80.**

The vote was:

	Ms. Latsis, Yes; Ms. Rieck, No; Ms. Sauve, Yes; Mr. Miller, No; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes; Mr. Brockelman, Yes.
ITEM 2	<p>CASE NO SDP21-004, CHRISTIAN HERITAGE CENTER / B1L1 [ARCADIA] / SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN (SDP) – PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT – MOLLY ORKILD-LARSON, PRINCIPAL PLANNER; JOSEPH BOATENG, ENGINEER</p> <p>Ms. Orkild-Larson 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 explained the applicant was seeking approval for a mixed housing development on 32.21 acres. She said this community would consist of 345 rental apartments and 162 for sale paired-homes, the apartments would be three-stories with a maximum height of 50 feet and the two-story paired-homes would have a maximum height of 35 feet. She stated this application also proposed a clubhouse and mailroom with maximum heights of 35 feet and 18 feet, respectively. She added that a five-acre public park was to be located in the northern portion of the site to provide a buffer between the homes north of the property and the development. She reported the Open Spaces Division and the applicant were in discussions regarding the park and its dedication to Arapahoe County. She said that a survey on the park's amenities had occurred and from the input received, the applicant and Open Spaces were solidifying the park's design. She stated public meetings had revealed concerns about traffic, school crowding, and increased crime and these had been addressed with a Traffic Impact Study (TIS), confirmation from the school district that schools in the area could handle the increase in students and that there was no evidence from local law enforcement to support that crime would increase. She explained there was currently a Commercial Mobile Radio System Facility (CMRS) located on the existing church and in order to continue telecommunication service in the area, this facility was proposed to be relocated to a new facility when the church was demolished. She added that the applicant was proposing a CMRS tower with a maximum height of 70 feet on the subject property. She said that at this time, the CMRS application was under review by the County and that the Board of County Commissioners had approved the Arcadia General Development Plan (GDP) on May 24, 2022 rezoning the property from R-A PUD to Planned Unit Development (PUD) with a maximum density of 17 dwelling units per acre. Ms. Orkild-Larson concluded that that staff recommended approval of the changes to the Specific Development Plan (SDP) as described in the presentation.</p> <p>The applicant's presentation team consisted of Nick Graham, VP of Development for DHI Communities; Marcus Pachner of the Pachner Co., who spoke about community engagement; Patrick Hannon of Norris Design, who attended via telephone; and Bonnie Niziolek of Norris Design. They presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record.</p>

Mr. Pachner stated that given the 13 -25 du/acre requirement, the project team could not meet it by implementing single family housing on this site. He explained they had designed paired homes with the park as a better solution to transition from neighboring single family to the multi-family section of the project. He described the 40 plus community outreach meetings and 224 survey responses to park wants and needs that were gathered by his company. He also described the approval criteria of a six access point design that was developed to mitigate expected traffic.

Ms. Niziolek discussed the 35% Open Space requirement for the project. She demonstrated that the five-acre park and the green spaces designed into the rest of the development met this requirement in full. She reiterated that park amenities had been surveyed with the neighboring communities. She explained this application was Part 2 of 3 step PUD application process. She confirmed the General Development Plan (GDP) had been approved on May 24, 2022. She explained this application for an SDP would be followed by an Administrative Site Plan (ASP) application to complete the process. She discussed the project's compliance with the review criteria and compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.

There were discussions regarding the following questions:

- If the park was only 5 acres, how was the Open Space requirement of 35% or 11 acres met?
- What were current sidewalk widths and how were they modified? What was meant by the term “powerful form” as used to describe the Clubhouse design?
- Would the usability of the parks be impacted by slope and drainage detention features located in them during inclement weather? Was stormwater detention counted as parkland dedication? How was cash in lieu for parks factored in this case?
- What height would the replacement telecommunication tower be and how would it be concealed?
- Is the TIS available for review?

Ms. Niziolek explained the park made up 5.45 acres of the Open Space requirement. She said the additional acreage was a combination of the two pocket parks, open landscape buffer areas and all green landscaped areas that provided connective walking and meeting areas between the different housing types. She stated this included the pool and clubhouse outdoor areas. She described the wide sidewalks along Alton that were part of this design that preserved existing trees and contributed to the walkway system of the development. Ms. Orkild-Larson confirmed that staff was responsible for counting the features and calculating acreage to meet the requirement. A member of the architectural design team, explained the term “powerful form” was used to describe how the vaulted ceiling of the clubhouse and the elongated sweeping sidewalks and other landscaping accentuated the gateway that it formed for passersby drawing them northward towards the

park. She stated this design was in response to feedback from neighborhood outreach.

Mr. Hannon, described the detention area in the main park as consisting of two concrete forebays, balanced by mostly sod and native trees with elevated concrete trails and a maintenance access that would go through the pond and help blend with park. He said this system was tied into the other drainage systems in the pocket parks. He stated that during a weather event perhaps one acre might be wet but would then dry out quickly. Ms. Orkild-Larson explained that cash in lieu for parkland was decided using a formula with multiple calculations to determine the number of acres required for Open Space in a development. She said that if a project had enough land to dedicate then cash in lieu would not be required.

Mr. Pachner responded that the telecommunications tower depicted in the presentation was conceptual architecture and the height and location would likely be modified based on the outcome of the CMRS case. He stated that FCC regulations however would have to be met for health reasons and the tower would be in compliance with those when constructed. The landscape architectural team described that all attending telecommunications equipment would be enclosed in a 25x35 foot structure and hidden behind a six foot wall with landscaping to conceal it.

Mr. Haskins reported that the TIS was available for review. He stated that he agreed with the conclusions of the traffic study that proposed traffic mitigation with existing conditions could accommodate the traffic in the area at the current Level of Service D. He recognized that at this level, the anticipated 35-60/secs per vehicle delay was significant. He explained that Parker Road in that area was the exception and is currently at LOS F. He added that this project would not further impact that level and cause it to worsen further.

Ms. Wollman opened the hearing for public comments.

There were 9 members of the public present, four of whom made comments and seven callers with comments. One had concerns about the traffic study assertions and impacts to traffic during construction. One expressed health concerns from the CMRS tower emissions. Five members of the Heritage Christian Center formerly on the site were in favor of this project and the value it would add to their community. Two other community members spoke in favor of the development; one was a local business owner who said the project was a significant upgrade to the community.

Mr. Pachner responded to traffic study concerns by pointing out that multiple access points made traffic safer while the proposed larger buildings would create a natural slowing effect. He stated that additional traffic signals could potentially be added to the design. He responded he would make sure that there would be a construction contact when the building commenced. He

	<p>reiterated that any design for the CMRS facility would be in complete compliance with FCC regulations for health and human safety.</p> <p>The public hearing was closed.</p> <p>The motion was made by Mr. Miller and duly seconded by Ms. Latsis, in the case of SDP21-004, Arcadia Specific Development Plan, the PC has reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments and has listened to the applicant's presentation and any public comment as presented at the hearing and hereby moves to approve 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 will address all Public Works and Development Staff comments. 2. The applicant shall finalized an agreement with Arapahoe County Open Spaces for the park prior to the approval of the Administrative Site Plan. SDP21-004– Arcadia Specific Development Plan PC Public Hearing Staff Report Page 13 of 13. 3. The applicant shall develop a mosquito control plan prior to the approval of the Administrative Site Plan. 4. The applicant shall comply with RTD's bus stop standards. <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Latsis, Yes; Ms. Rieck, No; Ms. Sauve, No; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes; Mr. Brockelman, Yes.</p>
ADJOURNMENT	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>