



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JANUARY 19, 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; Mark Brummel; Richard Rader; Jane Rieck; Richard Sall, and Diane Chaffin.</p> <p>Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Asst. County Attorney; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Sue Liu, Engineer; Sherman Feher, Senior Planner; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner, Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager; David Schmit, PWD Director, and members of the public.</p>
CALL TO ORDER	Chair Weiss called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted a quorum of the Board was present.
DISCLOSURE MATTERS	There were no Planning Commission member conflicts with the matters before them.
REGULAR ITEMS:	
Item 1:	<p>Z15-003, Denver Jewish Senior Living / Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) – Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>Ms. Orkild-Larson distributed information provided by the applicant and introduced the application for a PUD for assisted living and memory care for residents 55 years of age and older. She reported the property was located along Wabash, adjacent to the Denver Jewish Day School. She stated the height of the facility, which had originally been proposed for 55 feet, had been reduced to 47 feet, in response to neighborhood concerns. Ms. Orkild-Larson reported no residents would drive. She said the parking would include shared spaces with the adjacent school, verified by a letter from the school. She reported documentation had been provided via a parking study to demonstrate sufficiency of parking for the facility, as proposed;</p>

however, the proposal differed from the parking standards established within the Arapahoe County Land Development Code (LDC). Ms. Orkild-Larson stated referral comments were received from neighboring property owners with concerns about density, parking, and building height. Further, she stated the Four Square Mile Neighborhoods Association generally supported the use for the property, but noted concerns with building height. Ms. Orkild-Larson addressed several questions from Planning Commissioners and noted the applicant would be providing additional details when they presented.

John Griffis, Buccaneer Development, Inc., applicant / developer, introduced the project and project team, including Susan Stanton, Entitlement Advisor. He presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. He reviewed the site location and vicinity map. Mr. Griffis said the project provided a needed housing type in relation to the school, Wabash Street and Bridge, realignment of Wabash St Relationship to Cherry Creek, and regional detention facility across Wabash. He reported on neighborhood outreach with the immediate neighbors and residents of Cherry Creek Country Club. He stated the development team attended two meetings of the Four Square Mile Neighborhoods Association on September 30th (development review team) and October 14th (general meeting). Mr. Griffis summarized the comments and concerns that were heard as a result. He explained the reasoning for the 47-foot building height, for the three-story facility, had to do with the planned use of the building and the requirements for meeting needs not seen in single-family and multi-family housing. He presented the results of a view corridor study from four different views and explained the distances from the various homes (single-family homes and townhouses) and the golf course and showed visual perspectives of the views of the proposed building. Mr. Griffis summarized why Denver Jewish Senior Living was a good project, noting the following positive impacts: 1) the property dynamics, 2) various County plans, 3) use for senior living vs. apartments, 4) senior living use is essentially a “down zoning,” 5) negligible impacts to existing view corridors, 6) building height of 47 feet was lower than the CCCC Clubhouse height of 49 ft 6 in, 7) minimal traffic impact as no residents would drive, 8) provided a needed housing type in the community, and 9) provided employment opportunities.

The PC asked for clarification on whether any residents would be allowed to have a car and noted personal experiences with senior living residents who continued to drive and have their own cars available.

Mr. Gary Prager, H+L Architecture, architect, noted he had been doing these projects for 30 years and had yet to see an assisted living facility (as opposed to independent living) that would allow a resident to drive.

PC members asked questions about staff, visiting medical staff, and visitors coming to the site and how these people would be accommodated with parking.

There was discussion about parking calculations used by the Cities of Aurora and Lakewood and the City and County of Denver and how those compared to County regulations.

Mr. Weiss noted the requested parking ratio was lower than the applicant's parking study recommended.

Ms. Orkild-Larson noted some of the numbers were reported as peak parking usage for weekdays and weekends, during times of high visitation.

Mr. Brummel requested clarification on the agreement with the school to use part of its parking.

Mr. Griffis indicated there might be room for additional negotiation with the school for more spaces.

Ms. Chaffin asked for clarification on the 35% open space and whether that could be used to provide more parking.

Mr. Griffis noted the open space areas including a secured, outdoor garden for residents.

There were additional discussions regarding facilities for drop-offs and pick-ups of residents, location of parking, and access to the property.

Ms. Orkild-Larson noted the 35% open space was a code requirement for the SH-PUD district.

Mr.Griffis answered questions about the interior of the building that

led to the building height request. He noted there was currently no provider selected. As a result, the requirements could vary depending on which provider was selected and what kinds of systems and interior design were desired for resident comfort, special ventilation needs, additional ceiling height to compensate for the narrow profile of the building dictated by the property configuration, and a visual shielding of roof-mounted mechanical equipment. He explained deeper trusses allowed larger expanses without load-bearing walls, which provided greater flexibility to the provider on sizing units, placement of shared facilities, such as dining halls, etc. He stated once a provider was selected, the design of the project could be more specific.

Mr. Radar referenced an old landfill that was within 1,000 feet of the project and asked for the location.

Ms. Orkild-Larson noted there was an exhibit from Tri-County Health Department in the board packets.

Mr. Weiss opened the hearing for public comments.

Kevin Gross, S. Boston St., said he had met with the applicants as part of the Four Square Mile planning committee. He disagreed with the applicant's statement that the committee originally agreed to the 47-ft building height and later changed their minds. He felt the perspectives shown were misleading and that there might be other view corridors within which the building would be more visible. He indicated the Four Square Mile group did not initially comment on parking, given the opportunity for shared use with the school, but questioned the proximity to the facility and any future use of this building if it was no longer needed for senior living in the future. Mr. Gross noted Paul Hanley and Mark Lampert were unable to attend, but asked to be allowed to read their comments into the record. The letter he read noted most buildings in the Four Square Mile area were subject to a height restriction of 35 feet and the taller CCCC Clubhouse was isolated within the golf course and screened by a wall. Comments also voiced the opinion, as the current zoning on the property would have a height of 35 feet, that limit should apply to the new zoning and 47 feet was unacceptable for a three-story building. Comments also noted a negotiated 38-ft building height for Denver Senior Living at the time the PDP was approved by the Board for a proposed facility on Iliff.

Mr. Rich Laws, 8931 E Wesley Ave., stated he also disagreed with the perspectives in the view corridor study. He noted those were from the elevation of the golf course and the homes were all walk-out basement homes with two stories. He stated the view from the second story of these homes would be different. Mr. Laws also noted all homes along the eastern edge of the CCCC development were restricted to 35 ft. in height to protect view corridors of other homes and had been honored by the County. He shared having had several presubmittal meetings with staff on various projects. He was told a change in density would require a Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) amendment. Mr. Rich felt the project was not consistent with the density of the Four Square Mile SubArea Plan, but said the Wabash location might warrant a change in the density allowed by the Comp Plan. He shared his personal experience with another senior living facility that had significant street-parking impacts during times of high visitation. He stated the plans were too vague at this point; as more specific plans came forward, residents of CCCC would realize the proposed height was a bigger impact than they realized.

Mr. Halzel, 5603 S. Helena St., representing Denver Jewish Day School, confirmed parking was available and the parking spaces nearest the senior living site were least used by the school when it is in session. He stated the school supported the project and believed it would be a great addition to the neighborhood, as well as, a great relationship for the students of the school.

There were no further public comments.

The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Weiss offered the applicant an opportunity to respond to comments.

Mr. Griffis noted the differences between senior living and multi-family apartment homes. He believed there would be more flexibility in building height as plans were finalized with the Final Development Plan (FDP); however, the project team felt this was an appropriate maximum height for the PDP. He also noted marketing efforts by the school, over the past several years, and commented their development team was the only one to make an offer. Mr. Griffis noted this site was on a fringe area and wasn't close to higher-density areas of the community, with homes in closer

	<p>proximity, so impacts from height were different.</p> <p>The PC generally supported the use, but expressed concerns over the parking and building height. The PC asked staff why the building height would not be set at the FDP stage of the process when plans for the project were better known and closer to final, rather than approving height at the PDP stage when plans were still vague.</p> <p>Ms. Orkild-Larson noted that heights and setbacks were considered zoning parameters.</p> <p>Mr. Griffis indicated, if parking and building heights were issues that would prevent the case from moving forward, the applicants would appreciate a continuance for additional time to work on this. He felt discrepancies could be worked out within the next couple of weeks.</p> <p>It was moved by Ms. Rieck and duly seconded by Mr. Brummel to continue Case No. Z15-003, Denver Jewish Senior Living / Preliminary Development Plan, to a date certain of February 2, 2016 at 6:30 p.m. to allow the applicant additional time to work on height and parking concerns.</p> <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Mr. Weiss, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Rader, Yes, Mr. Sall, Yes.</p>
<p>Item 2:</p>	<p>Z15-005, KOA Kampground Stasburg / Conventional Rezone – Sherman Feher, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>Mr. Feher, Senior Planner, introduced the case and provided a summary of the application request.</p> <p>Mr. Jacobson, applicant, explained the proposal to expand the existing KOA campground, its high usage during summer months, and the desire to provide a safe, clean, family atmosphere for camping and related social activities for campers and visitors to the area. He noted the expansion would allow them to serve more customers and would bring additional visitors and economic benefits to the area.</p> <p>Mr. Brummel had some questions of clarification as to the</p>

expansion with respect to the creek bed.

Ms. Rieck asked how long people generally stayed at the campground.

Mr. Jacobson responded about one-third stayed one night, approximately one-third stayed four or five days and made day trips to other locations, and slightly less than one-third stayed monthly, while working in the area.

There were continued discussions related to proximity to the creek bed, changes needed due to location of part of the facility within the flood zone (higher bases for electrical connections), how long the current owners had run the campground (since 2012), and whether there had been any flood problems within the campground (there was water in the creek, but not in the campground since the owners purchased the property).

Mr. Weiss opened the hearing for public comments.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed.

Mr. Feher stated staff was recommending approval with the listed conditions in the staff report. He noted the project could actually expand to the other side of the creek, though that was not currently being proposed; further, that expansion would need to be worked out with engineering. He reported, should the applicant determine to expand to the other side of the creek, no additional hearings would be required because use was allowed within the O and F zone districts.

Mr. Brummel noted camping on the east side of the creek would require additional exits in case the creek floods while people were camping; he felt that would be a major undertaking.

Ms. Liu indicated a new drainage study was just completed and no bridge was planned. She explained that even though there was not another land development approval required additional engineering permit processes, if additional camping facilities were planned.

Mr. Haskins addressed additional questions on floodplain requirements for camping facilities and RV storage.

	<p>Mr. Feher stated storage must be accessory to camping; RV storage was not an allowed use.</p> <p>It was moved by Mr. Weiss and duly seconded by Ms. Rieck to recommend approval of Case Z15-005, KOA Kampground Strasburg / Conventional Rezone, with staff findings and conditions as outlined in the staff report dated January 7, 2016.</p> <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Mr. Weiss, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Rader, Yes, Mr. Sall, Yes.</p>
<p>STUDY SESSION ITEMS:</p>	
<p>Item 1:</p>	<p>Land Development Code (LDC) Assessment – Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager</p> <p>Mary Roberts, Clarion Associates, presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record.</p> <p>The PC expressed concerns about a potentially reduced role in land development cases and the loss of a public forum for people to discuss development in their neighborhoods.</p> <p>Ms. Roberts noted the PC would continue to conduct hearings on initial zoning and PUD's, so there would still be a public forum.</p> <p>Time was spent discussing thresholds for site plan and final development plan public hearings and examples from other communities. It was noted other communities required public hearings for site plans that were: 1) over a certain acreage or square footage, 2) considering 24-hour uses, 3) adjacent to residential areas, 4) expected to exceed a certain number of dwelling units, etc.</p> <p>Ms. Roberts said that part of developing the LDC would be determining which public hearing thresholds were appropriate for Arapahoe County.</p> <p>The Board of County Commissioners expressed a desire to have a better organized, more image-heavy, and user friendly LDC.</p>
<p>ADJOURNMENT</p>	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>