ARAPAHOE COUNTY
COLORADO'S FIRST

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION TUESDAY, AUGUST 2, 2016

ATTENDANCE	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: Paul Rosenberg, Chair; Brian Weiss, Chair Pro-Tem; Richard Rader; Jane Rieck; and Richard Sall. Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Assistant County Attorney; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Spencer Smith, Engineer; Bill Skinner, Senior Planner; Caitlyn Cahill, Animal Control Supervisor; Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager; Jeff Strauss, Audio/Visual, and members of the public.
CALL TO ORDER	Chair Rosenberg called the meeting to order at 6:35 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.
	GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES	**The motion was made by Mr. Weiss and duly seconded by Ms. Rieck to accept the minutes from the June 14, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, as presented.** **The motion passed unanimously.** **The motion was then made by Ms. Rieck and duly seconded by Mr. Sall to accept the minutes from the June 21, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, as amended, to revise Study Session Item "Ms. Yeckes and Mr. Hill spoke individually with each Planning Commission member to discover whether there was confusion, as some neighbors had asserted." to add "It was concluded there was no confusion."** **The motion passed.**

The audio recording is the official County record of this meeting.
Written minutes are a summary of the meeting and provided as a courtesy only.

	The motion was then made by Ms. Rieck and duly seconded by Mr. Sall to accept the minutes from the <u>July 5, 2016</u> Planning Commission meeting, as presented. **The motion passed.** **The motion was then made by Ms. Rieck and duly seconded by Mr. Rader to accept the minutes from the <u>July 19, 2016</u> Planning Commission meeting, as presented.** **The motion passed.**
REGULAR ITEMS:	
Item 2:	**Case No. P16-010, Sky Mark Apartments / Final Development Plan (FDP) – Sherman Feher, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development Department (PWD)** Mr. Rosenberg announced agenda items would be taken out of order. He explained the applicant for Case No. P16-010 requested a continuance of today's hearing, to a date certain of August 16, 2016, because of the anticipated length of the hearing for Littleton Valley Villas case. **It was moved by Ms. Rieck and duly seconded by Mr. Sall to continue Case No. P16-010, Sky Mark Apartments / Final Development Plan, to the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission, which would be held on Tuesday, August 16, 2016 @ 6:30 p.m., in the Arapahoe Room at Lima Plaza, 6954 S Lima St., Centennial, CO 80112.** **The vote was:** **Mr. Weiss, Yes; Mr. Rosenberg, Yes; Ms. Rieck, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Mr. Rader, Yes.**
Item 1:	**Case No. Z16-001, Littleton Valley Villas / Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)** Mr. Rosenberg provided an overview of the meeting process for the 80+ people in attendance.

The audio recording is the official County record of this meeting.
Written minutes are a summary of the meeting and provided as a courtesy only.

	Ms. Orkild-Larson established jurisdiction and provided a summary of the case. She stated staff had received dozens of comments from the public in the form of calls, letters, and emails, copies of which were included in the Planning Commissioner's (PC) packets. She said the majority opposed the proposal. As requested, Ms. Orkild-Larson read the concerns contained in the Littleton School District referral letter and provided answers to those questions. She stated staff was recommending denial of the application, based on findings in the staff report. Rick Holpp, Site Dynamics, Inc. and KB Home Colorado, presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. He introduced the design team who provided an overview of the proposed project. Paired home lot detail was shown. The comprehensive plan goals were outlined in detail. A map of land uses, along South Platte Canyon Road, were shown and color-coded to demonstrate the compatibility and transition. Mr. Holpp reviewed project benefits and responded to staff findings, specifically their opposition of said findings. There were discussions regarding density, other similarly designed sites in unincorporated Arapahoe County (AC), cross-sections with elevation changes and trees depicted graphically vs. actual size of trees for the first few years after planting (willing to negotiate with staff on larger trees), width of private streets and whether they would accommodate pedestrians walking through the neighborhood (pedestrian circulation is connected to front of units with sidewalks and trail and not along the private roads, which were the back garage entries), whether the trailhead would be redesigned from its current configuration (working with South Suburban Parks and Recreation District on a redesign and reasons for redesign). Mr. Rosenberg explained the public comment process and opened the hearing for public comments. Approximately 20 people spoke in opposition of the project, siting the following as obstacles: 1. Traffic congestion 2. Access from Bowles 3. Overcrowding of schools 4. Proximity of buildings to nearby properties 5. Height of buildings 6. Inadequate setbacks / buffers 7. Lack of neighborhood participation during summer meetings 8. Project does not provide any benefits for the neighborhood

The audio recording is the official County record of this meeting.
Written minutes are a summary of the meeting and provided as a courtesy only.

9. Noise
10. Zoned for Single Family Residences to protect other neighborhoods.
11. Too high density
12. Safety/Security
13. Poor design and sight line at access points
14. Property should be annexed into Littleton and developed in a suitable manner
15. Lack of visitor parking

A handful of people spoke in favor of the project, stating the proposed changes would attract younger buyers to the neighborhood and give them much needed opportunities, such as great school districts. They felt it was an appropriate project type for the site. The property owner stated he had spoken with 1,000 people who agreed they would like to see these types of homes available to them in the Littleton area.

The applicant was given an opportunity to address public comments/concerns. It was reported all homes fronting S. Platte Canyon Road would be front doors. Also front doors facing all adjacent property owners; the rear elevations face inward to the project. It was stated the Comp Plan created a unique community by creating more housing diversity and a new price-point to the area. Access from W. Bowles Avenue would likely be retained for school buses. The applicant stated they could look at gating. The only other bus route would require backing up the bus in the neighborhood. It was noted a "successful project" was one that was approved and built; where people bought homes and enjoyed the community.

There were continued discussions regarding some of the case details, such as the number of expected students as a result of the project; access, emergency access, annexation, traffic, zoning, comp plan, density, buffering, the possibility of commercial vs. residential, home prices, and potential tax revenue.

It was moved by Ms. Rieck and duly seconded by Mr. Rader, in the case of Z16-001, Littleton Valley Villas / Preliminary Development Plan, that the Planning Commission had read the staff report and received testimony at the public and found themselves in agreement with staff findings 1 through 3, including all plans and attachments as set forth in the staff report dated July 25, 2016, and recommended the Board of County Commissioners <u>deny</u> the request for a Preliminary Development Plan to change from Residential District (R-2) to Residential PUD-Moderate Density (R-PM).

The audio recording is the official County record of this meeting.
Written minutes are a summary of the meeting and provided as a courtesy only.

	The vote was: **Mr. Weiss, No; Ms. Rieck, Yes; Mr. Rader, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Mr. Rosenberg, No.**
ADJOURNMENT	There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.

The audio recording is the official County record of this meeting.
Written minutes are a summary of the meeting and provided as a courtesy only.