



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JANUARY 5, 2016**

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 confirmed their continued qualification to serve:</p> <p>Brian Weiss, Chair; Paul Rosenberg, Chair Pro-Tem; Mark Brummel; Richard Rader; Richard Sall, Diane Chaffin.</p> <p>Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Asst. County Attorney; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Spencer Smith, Engineer; Bill Skinner, Senior Planner; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager, and members of the public.</p>
CALL TO ORDER	<p>Chair Weiss called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted a quorum of the Board was present.</p>
DISCLOSURE MATTERS	<p>There were no Planning Commission (PC) member conflicts with the matters before them.</p>
GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:	
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES	<p>The motion was made by Mr. Rosenberg and duly seconded by Mr. Sall to accept the minutes from the December 1, 2015 Planning Commission meeting, as presented.</p> <p>The motion passed 5-0-1; Mr. Weiss, Abstain.</p>
BUSINESS ITEMS	
Item 1:	<p>Case No. L15-004, Cherry Creek Academy – Jayson Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager</p> <p>Mr. Reynolds presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. He reported a public charter school in the Cherry Creek school district planned to expand their parking lot into the existing playground area, relocate the playground to the north side of the athletic field, perform some drainage</p>

	<p>improvements, and convert the athletic field to artificial turf. He explained, under state statute, schools must advise local jurisdictions of their plans and the PC may comment on the proposal. Mr. Reynolds reported no meeting notice was required; however, staff mailed letters to all addresses abutting the school property on E. Fair Lane, as well as, to several nearby Homeowner’s Associations (HOAs). He stated staff had received no responses from either neighbors or the HOAs. Mr. Reynolds asked the PC to recommend additional landscaping along the north side of the relocated playground, to potentially mitigate noise and stray objects.</p> <p>The applicant agreed to the condition.</p> <p>Representatives of Cherry Creek Academy were present to address any questions.</p> <p>No members of the public attended the meeting.</p> <p>It was moved by Mr. Brummel and duly seconded by Ms. Chaffin to recommend approval of Case No. L15-004, Cherry Creek Academy, with staff recommendations, as presented.</p> <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Mr. Weiss, Yes; Mr. Rosenberg, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Rader, Yes, Mr. Sall, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

REGULAR ITEMS

<p>Item 1:</p>	<p>Case No. P15-007, Copperleaf #12 / Final Development Plan (FDP)</p> <p>Bill Skinner, Senior Planner, introduced the case and summarized the proposal. He stated KB Homes was proposing 124 paired home units at a density of about 10 units per acre. He reported the project would be similar to the Parkside Villas project in the Four Square Mile area. He said no members of the public contacted staff during the project. Mr. Skinner reported, as part of the project, the master developer would install a sidewalk connection south to E. Radcliff Parkway to provide connectivity to the elementary school.</p> <p>The PC asked about a connection north to E. Quincy Avenue and after discussions, the applicant agreed to provide that connection as well.</p>
-----------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The applicant also provided an overview of the project, saying it would provide 4 acres of common open space (30% of the site). The project would contain one east-west public street with on-street parking; the rest of the streets would be private. The applicant shared some conceptual building architecture, noting it was still pending approval by the architectural review committee.

The PC asked about the State's water comments. Staff explained the applicant was in the process of securing a will-serve letter from East Cherry Creek Valley, which would be required, before the plat was approved. It was noted, in the past, the State found will-serve letters from districts to be satisfactory.

Commissioners Rosenberg, Rader, and Chaffin asked questions about the distribution and amount of visitor parking on the property.

The applicant pointed out they were exceeding the County's minimum requirement as they would be providing 0.5 visitor parking spaces per unit, rather than 0.25 spaces per unit.

Staff indicated more visitor parking was available on the north side of the project; however, even the south side met the minimum parking requirement.

Commissioner Chaffin asked about including more ADA visitor parking.

The applicant indicated they were providing some ADA spots, even though none were required for this type of development.

The PC expressed concern that commercial wasn't developing in Copperleaf, as promised.

The developer responded they need more rooftops to attract the commercial.

Commissioner Rader suggested adding more visitor parking adjacent to the detention pond.

The applicant indicated that would be difficult to accomplish given utilities in the area.

Mr. Weiss opened the public hearing.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed.

	<p>It was moved by Mr. Brummel and duly seconded by Mr. Sall to recommend Case No. P15-007, Copperleaf #12 / FDP, favorably to the Board of County Commissioners, based on the findings and conditions of the staff report and with an additional condition requiring construction of the off-site sidewalk north to Quincy, as discussed.</p> <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Mr. Weiss, Yes; Mr. Rosenberg, No; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Rader, No, Mr. Sall, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes.</p>
<p>APPROVAL OF 2016 MEETING DATES</p>	<p>There were discussions regarding 2016 PC meeting dates. It was noted March 1st was the Democratic Caucus and October 24th was Rosh Hashanah. It was recommended the PC meet on March 8th as an alternative date in March.</p> <p>It was noted the Election of Board Officers would be conducted after February 9, 2016, once the Board of County Commissioners reappointed certain PC Members.</p> <p>There were discussions regarding bylaws, quorums, and board vacancies. Ms. Yeckes stated there would be time for more detailed discussions, during a review of the PC bylaws, at a future meeting.</p> <p>There were additional discussions related to the County's ability to limit annexations, such as the large one the City of Aurora was contemplating.</p>
<p>APPROVAL OF 2016 AGENDA POSTING LOCATIONS</p>	<p>The motion was made and duly seconded to approve the posting location for PC meeting agendas.</p> <p>The motion passed 5-0-1; Mr. Rosenberg, Abstain.</p>
<p>APPRECIATION LUNCHEON</p>	<p>The annual PC appreciation dinner was discussed. It was noted, typically, the dinner was held prior to a PC meeting in the early part of the new year. The PC stated they preferred having the dinner on a meeting night and suggested A Perfect Landing restaurant as a possible venue.</p>
<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>