



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, JULY 19, 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; Richard Rader; Jane Rieck; and Diane Chaffin.</p> <p>Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Assistant County Attorney; Sherman Feher, Senior Planner; Spencer Smith, Engineer; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager, 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>GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:</b>	
<b>APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES</b>	<p><b>The motion was made by Mr. Weiss and duly seconded by Ms. Chaffin to accept the minutes from the <u>April 19, 2016</u> Planning Commission meeting, as presented.</b></p> <p><b>The motion passed 4-0-1; Ms. Rieck, Abstained.</b></p> <p><b>The motion was then made by Ms. Rieck and duly seconded by Mr. Weiss to accept the minutes from the <u>May 17, 2016</u> Planning Commission meeting, as presented.</b></p> <p><b>The motion passed unanimously.</b></p> <p><b>The motion was then made by Ms. Chaffin and duly seconded by Mr. Rader to accept the minutes from the <u>June 7, 2016</u> Planning Commission meeting, as presented.</b></p> <p><b>The motion passed unanimously.</b></p>

**REGULAR ITEMS:**

**Item 1:**

**Case No. P15-011, Centennial East Corporate Center #03 [A-Plus Athletics] / Final Development Plan (FDP) – Sherman Feher, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)**

Mr. Feher introduced the case and explained the applicant was requesting the addition of recreational uses to the existing Final Development Plan (FDP) for the property. He stated their Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) included recreational uses, among a list of permitted uses; however, the current FDP finalized only office / warehouse uses for the project. He reported the applicant wanted to lease additional space to a gymnastics training facility that already occupied a portion of the building.

Brian Ostler, applicant, on behalf of City Lighting, owners, explained that City Lighting, had not included recreational uses when the office / warehouse development was approved through a Final Development Plan. He reported City Lighting, subsequently, had leased a portion of the space to A-Plus Athletics, and a Certificate of Occupancy was issued by the County Building Division. He explained City Lighting was relocating its business to a new building within the subdivision and the gymnastics facility owner would like to expand to occupy the area formerly occupied by City Lighting. Mr. Ostler reported, when applying for interior tenant finish permits, County staff determined that the gymnastics facility was not an allowed use and the FDP needed to be amended. He explained the interior changes to the building to accommodate the expanded and relocated use for the gymnastics facility was an A-class occupancy. Mr. Ostler circulated tenant finish plans to the Planning Commission (PC). He reported no changes were proposed to the exterior of the building for this use.

There were PC questions related to parking, drop-off and pick-up of students, the use of queuing lanes, and trip counts.

Erik Oldham, owner of A-Plus Athletics, addressed questions about occupancy, parking, queuing, and traffic circulation. He stated the expansion was not for the purpose of expanding the number of students (currently 35 students at one time). He explained that the students were growing up and advancing their skills. As a result, more space was needed to allow for movement and to reduce interactions between younger and older students who have different needs. He also explained how the trip data was gathered and how traffic would circulate at the building to allow for drop-offs and pick-ups.

	<p>There were questions regarding landscaping and date of anticipated occupancy.</p> <p>Mr. Rosenberg opened the hearing for public comments.</p> <p>There were no public comments.</p> <p>The public hearing was closed.</p> <p>Mr. Feher stated the application was recommended for approval with conditions as outlined in the staff report.</p> <p>Mr. Weiss cautioned the applicant that there might be additional steps to go through with the Building Division due to the occupancy type and the occupancy level being greater than his requirements.</p> <p>Mr. Ostler stated he had already discussed the expansion with Building Division staff and understood what was needed.</p> <p><b>It was moved by Ms. Chaffin and duly seconded by Ms. Rieck, in the case of P15-011, Centennial East Corporate Center/A Plus Athletics Final Development Plan Amendment, 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 July 8, 2016, and recommended approval of the case, subject to the following conditions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. The applicant will make all modifications to the Final Development Plan Amendment Exhibit as requested by the Public Works and Development Department.</b></li> <li><b>2. The applicant will address all Engineering Services Division and SEMSWA comments and concerns, as identified within their reports, prior to signing of the mylars.</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. Rosenberg, Yes.</b></p> <p>Ms. Yeckes stated the application would move forward to the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) for final action.</p>
<p><b>ANNOUNCEMENTS</b></p>	<p>Ms. Yeckes made the following announcements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notices were distributed for two upcoming public meetings/open houses, copies of which were retained for the record.</li> <li>➤ <u>Ms. Yeckes reported the I-25/Creek Interchange and Corridor Study was scheduled for July 28, 2016.</u> She said the County was conducting the study in partnership with the City of</li> </ul>

	<p>Centennial and the Southeast Public Improvement Metropolitan District.</p> <p>Mr. Rosenberg noted the meeting date conflicted with the Arapahoe County Fair opening dinner on Thursday night. He also asked about having the Transportation Division come and explain the project to the PC, as the PC reviewed many projects in the area.</p> <p>Mr. Reynolds stated Bryan Weimer, Transportation Division Manager, was scheduled to attend the August 16, 2016 PC meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Rosenberg also asked that staff pass along concerns to the Transportation Division about the safety of traffic control at I-25 and Dry Creek. He stated it was very confusing.</p> <p>➤ <u>Ms. Yeckes reported two County open houses were planned for August 2nd at the Administration Building and August 9<sup>th</sup> at the Arapahoe County Fairgrounds.</u> She stated the meetings were primarily scheduled to receive public input on the proposed changes to the Planned Unit Development process within the Land Development Code, but also to provide information on a number of other County projects and services, including the bicycle/pedestrian plan currently underway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ms. Yeckes reported the Highline Canal Conservancy was holding a series of meetings on future management plans of the Highline Canal. She noted this was not a County project. She said the project was discussed at the July, 2016 Four Square Mile Neighborhoods Association meeting.</li> <li>• Ms. Yeckes stated the August 2, 2016 Planning Commission meeting was scheduled to be held at the Arapahoe County Administration Building, East Hearing Room. She reported two public hearings would be heard that evening.</li> </ul> <p>The Planning Commissioners requested the staff reports be provided early, if possible.</p>
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.