



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, JUNE 7, 2016**

<b>ATTENDANCE</b>	<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>Paul Rosenberg, Chair; Brian Weiss, Chair Pro-Tem; Mark Brummel; Richard Rader; Jane Rieck; Richard Sall, and Diane Chaffin.</p> <p>Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Assistant County Attorney; Julio Iturreria, Long Range Planning Program Manager; Larry Mugler, Demographics Planner; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager; Bill Skinner, Senior Planner; Sherman Feher, Senior Planner; Caitlyn Cahill, Animal Control Supervisor, and members of the public.</p>
<b>CALL TO ORDER</b>	<p>Chair Rosenberg called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted a quorum of the Board was present.</p>
<b>DISCLOSURE MATTERS</b>	<p>There were no Planning Commission member conflicts with the matters before them.</p>
<b>REGULAR ITEMS:</b>	
<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS</b>	<p>Ms. Yeckes reported the June 14, 2016 Special Meeting of the Planning Commission was scheduled to be held in the Arapahoe Room; however, the June 21, 2016 Regular Meeting was scheduled to be held in the Colorado State University Extension Office due to the Primary Election.</p>
<b>Item 1:</b>	<p><b>Case No. F16-001, Strasburg Station / Comprehensive Plan Amendment – Julio Iturreria, Long Range Planning, Public Works and Development (PWD)</b></p> <p>Mr. Brummell indicated he lived next door to, and has had business transactions with the applicant. He stated he had no financial interest in the case. He offered to recuse himself if any members of Planning</p>

Commission or the applicant had concerns; however, there were none.

Mr. Sall disclosed that his firm had done work for the applicant.

Mr. Rosenberg disclosed that he served on the board for the I-70 Corridor Regional Economic Advancement Partnership (REAP), who provided a letter regarding this item; however, stated he did not attend the meeting where the case had been discussed.

Julio Iturreria, Long Range Planning Manager, entered additional public comment letters into the record. He provided an overview of the proposed application. He stated the Strasburg Sub-Area Plan was a joint effort by Adams County and Arapahoe County. He reported Adams County had offered some suggested language, which was incorporated in the proposal. Mr. Iturreria had offered to attend an Adams County Planning Commission meeting; however, Adams County did not see a need for it.

Todd Messenger, Fairfield & Woods, asked the Planning Commissioners to approve a change to the Low Intensity Mixed Use (LIMU) portion of the Strasburg Sub-Area Plan to allow residential uses in the LIMU portion of Strasburg, generally located south of Colfax and west of Wagner Street. He noted the LIMU section of the 2002 Strasburg Sub-Area Plan said if housing conditions changed then the plan should consider adding housing to the LIMU area. The applicant said with two recessions, since 2002, housing conditions had changed; further, he stated the project met the criteria identified for comprehensive plan changes.

There were discussions related to other Fairfield & Woods developments in Strasburg.

Mr. Rosenberg opened the hearing for public comments.

Three members of the public spoke in opposition to the change, including the Principal of the elementary school and the director of the Parks and Recreation District. Concerns included potential crowding in the schools, lack of sidewalks connecting the sites to downtown Strasburg, increased traffic, and lack of connections to recreation sites south of I-70. Two attendees opposed the proposal but didn't wish to speak.

The applicant responded to concerns and questions and indicated a willingness to discuss and work through issues that might arise during the zoning application process.

	<p>There were discussions related to potential density, the desirability of residential next to I-70 and the railroad, the potential for retail on the property (as anticipated by the Sub-Area Plan), and noise issues.</p> <p><b>It was moved by Mr. Weiss and duly seconded by Mr. Rosenberg, in the case of F16-001 – Strasburg Subarea Plan Amendment to modify the definition of Low Intensity Mixed use, the Planning Commission has read the staff report dated May 27, 2016, and has considered additional information presented during the public hearing. The Planning Commission agrees with the staff findings and recommendation that this is an appropriate change and approval is warranted using the language recommended by Adams County. The Planning Commission approves the change to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>the Characteristics and Uses of Low Intensity Mixed Use on page 15 to read, “Light industrial, office, retail and a mix of residential uses or multifamily in either planned unit development or straight zoning request;”</b></li> <li>• <b>the Purpose of Low Intensity Mixed Use on page 15 to read, “Attract businesses and employment opportunities and diversify housing stock;” and</b></li> <li>• <b>delete the sentence on the top of page 7 that reads “Policy: If residential market conditions change, Arapahoe County may look at the possibility of adding residential land use to the “Low Intensity Mixed Use” category in the next 3 to 5 years,” based on the findings outlined in the staff report dated May 27, 2016.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>The vote was:</b></p> <p><b>Mr. Weiss, Yes; Ms. Rieck, No; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Rader, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Mr. Rosenberg, Yes.</b></p>
<p><b>Item 2:</b></p>	<p><b>Case No. P16-002, Iliff Avenue Townhomes / Final Development Plan (FDP) – Sherman Feher, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</b></p> <p>Mr. Sall disclosed that his employer had worked for Alpert Development in the past.</p> <p>Mr. Feher summarized the project, which included 68 townhome units on 3.5 acres with about 39% open space. He stated the site was located northeast of S Wabash Street and E Iliff Avenue. He reported staff was recommending approval.</p> <p>Scott Alpert, applicant, presented the proposed site plan and indicated he had several meetings with nearby Homeowner’s</p>

Associations (HOAs) and the Four Square Mile neighborhood organization. He reported receiving favorable comments, possibly because of the way the site looked with dilapidated homes and junk. Mr. Alpert agreed to requested heights and density and believed he had taken care of the FDP issues. He showed building elevations and the detention facility along Iliff. He said they preferred to make the detention ponds into amenities.

Planning Commission asked questions about the  $\frac{3}{4}$  access from Iliff, coordinating Iliff sidewalk designs with the county's project, on-site recreation amenities, pricing for the units, and school district cash-in-lieu.

Chuck Haskins, Engineering Division Manager, said the access was adequate and that eastbound traffic could use the protected left turn at S Wabash Street to make a u-turn.

Mr. Alpert stated he had attempted to secure access west to S Wabash Street but was unsuccessful. He hadn't determined whether to rent or sell the units. He estimated rents would be around \$2,000/month or sales price of \$400,000.

Mr. Rosenberg opened the hearing for public comment.

There were no public comments.

The public hearing was closed.

**It was moved by Ms. Chaffin and duly seconded by Mr. Brummel, in the case of P16-002, Iliff Avenue Townhomes Final Development Plan, that the Planning Commission had read the staff report and received testimony at the public hearing and found themselves in agreement with staff findings, including the draft plan and attachments as set forth in the staff report dated May 23, 2016, and recommend the case favorably to the Board of County Commissioners, subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. The applicant must make all modifications to the Final Development Plan Amendment as requested by the Public Works and Development Department.**
- 2. The applicant agrees to address all Engineering Services Division and SEMSWA comments and concerns, as identified within their reports, prior to signed mylars.**
- 3. The applicant will enter into a Subdivision Improvement Agreement and provide collateral to the County for all public improvements associated with the project.**

	<p>4. The applicant will comply with all Cunningham Fire Protection District referral comments.</p> <p>5. Per the applicant’s letter of intent, which states they will provide a playground, the applicant will need to show a playground and generalized playground equipment on the Final Development Plan.</p> <p>6. Per the Board of County Commissioner’s-approved Preliminary Development Plan condition of approval, the applicant will bury utilities and dedicate right-of-way as required by the County.</p> <p>7. Per the Board of County Commissioner’s approved Preliminary Development Plan condition of approval, the applicant will obtain and follow CPTED recommendations from the Sheriff’s Department.</p> <p><b>The vote was:</b></p> <p><b>Mr. Weiss, Yes; Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Rader, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Mr. Rosenberg, Yes.</b></p>
<p><b>Item 3:</b></p>	<p><b>Case No. P16-006, Inverness Subdivision #57 / L3 / [Vallagio Retail] / Final Development Plan (FDP) – Bill Skinner, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</b></p> <p>Mr. Skinner stated this project was the last open pad site in the Vallagio retail center, which was located south of Dry Creek Road and east of Inverness Drive West. He reported the County previously approved a FDP for this site in 2008, which included a retail/restaurant building. He reported the proposed site plan included a 9,000 square foot medical office building with underground parking and surface parking. He received some questions from retail tenants concerned about parking impacts; he noted there was a joint parking agreement which allowed users to share parking.</p> <p>Dan Horvat, Horvat Architects, representing the owners, complimented Bill Skinner on how communicative he had been through the process. He showed images of the building and explained that parking was a concern for them. Their proposed 9,000 square foot building would remove some existing parking spaces but because they were providing 22 underground parking spaces there would be 34 surface parking spaces available on their lot for medical clients, retail users, or Eddie Merlot’s. Mr. Horvat presented a parking analysis showing expected, on-site parking space usage at different times of the day, as well as a parking study for the entire Vallagio complex.</p>

There were discussions regarding the shared parking arrangement, how many spaces Eddie Merlot's was likely to use when it opened for lunch, the fact that Eddie Merlot's received a reduced parking requirement, and the potential for valet parking.

Staff pointed out the proposal exceeded the minimum parking standards for this type of use and noted the County's parking standards for restaurants were much higher than standard practice.

Mr. Rosenberg opened the hearing for public comment.

One member of the public spoke in favor of the project as a representative of the retail building. He said they had concerns and performed the parking study to address their concerns, the lender's concerns, and Eddy Merlot's concerns. He said the study addressed those concerns. He noted that the site is near light rail and as a transit oriented development the parking is tight by design.

There were no further public comments.

The public hearing was closed.

The Planning Commission discussed parking concerns. Mr.

Rosenberg said he wouldn't support creating a bigger parking problem.

**It was moved by Mr. Brummel and duly seconded by Mr. Rader, in the case of P16-006, Inverness No. 57, Lot 3, Vallagio Medical Offices Final Development Plan, that the Planning Commission has read the staff report and received testimony at the public hearing and find themselves in agreement with staff findings 1 through 3, including all plans and attachments as set forth in the staff report dated May 25, 2016, and recommend this case favorably to the Board of County Commissioners, subject to the following condition of approval:**

- 1. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans, all minor modifications shall be made as required by the Arapahoe County Public Works & Development Department.**

**The vote was:**

**Mr. Weiss, Yes; Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Rader, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Mr. Rosenberg, No.**

<p><b>Item 4:</b></p>	<p><b>Case No. P16-003, Inverness Subdivision #22 / L1 / 4<sup>th</sup> Final Development Plan (FDP) Amendment – Bill Skinner, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</b></p> <p>Mr. Skinner presented the proposal, which was for an approximately 50 square foot sign to be located near the top of the building, facing I-25. He explained the sign did not meet Arapahoe County’s code requirements, but the Board of County Commissioners could adjust the signage through the PUD process. He said, given the context of the I-25 corridor, staff was recommending approval.</p> <p>In response to a Planning Commission question, the applicant, Mike Johnson, indicated that the building is about 85’ tall, or 100’ tall from the loading dock side.</p> <p>Mr. Rosenberg opened the hearing for public comment.</p> <p>There were no public comments.</p> <p>The public hearing was closed.</p> <p>Planning Commissioners remarked that the sign was relatively small compared to other signs in the area.</p> <p><b>It was moved by Ms. Chaffin and duly seconded by Mr. Sall, in the case of P16-003, Inverness No. 61, Lot 1, Final Development Plan 4th Amendment – AT&amp;T Logo Sign, that the Planning Commission had read the staff report and received testimony at the public hearing and found themselves in agreement with staff findings 1 through 3, including all plans and attachments as set forth in the staff report dated May 25, 2016, and recommended the case favorably to the Board of County Commissioners, subject to the following:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans, all minor modifications shall be made as required by the Arapahoe County Public Works and Development Department.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>The vote was:</b></p> <p><b>Mr. Weiss, Yes; Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Rader, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Mr. Rosenberg, Yes.</b></p>
<p><b>ADJOURNMENT</b></p>	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>