



**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 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 were in attendance:</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 Asst. County Attorney; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Sue Liu, Engineer; Sherman Feher, Senior Planner; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; Julio Iturreria, Long Range Planning Program Manager; and members of the public.</p>
CALL TO ORDER	<p>Chair Rosenberg 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 member conflicts with the matters before them.</p>
GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:	
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES	<p>The motion was made by Ms. Rieck and duly seconded by Mr. Weiss to accept the minutes from the September 6, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, as presented.</p> <p>The motion passed unanimously.</p>
REGULAR ITEMS:	
Item 1:	<p>Case No. P16-011, Sky Ranch / Preliminary Plat (PP) – Sherman Feher, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>It was noted Case Nos. P16-011 and Z16-003 would be presented at the same time, with a single public hearing; however, two separate motions would be required.</p>

Mr. Feher introduced the case. The original Sky Ranch Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) was approved in 2004 and the County approved a minor amendment in 2006. The proposal would reduce the dwellings from 750 to 525 in Neighborhood B (located in the western part of the project) and remove non-residential uses from Neighborhood B. The overall residential unit and non-residential square footage would remain the same – 4,000 residential units and 1.15 million square feet of non-residential uses for the entirety of the Sky Ranch development. The proposed Preliminary Plat establishes super blocks for Neighborhood B. Mr. Feher provided two additional referral comments: a letter of support from REAP and no objections from Anadarko, who owns mineral rights in a portion of Sky Ranch. Staff recommended approval.

The Planning Commission asked questions about water, the transfer of zoning between different owners, and the DRCOG urban growth boundary.

Staff replied that the State water engineer reviews the water at Final Plat and the county has received feedback that the State prefers not to see cases early. The 2004 Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) helped establish the water provided as well. Staff further explained that zoning stays with the land and doesn't go away if a new owner purchases the property.

Julio Iturreria, Long Range Planning, stated Sky Ranch has enough urban growth area to develop.

Mark Harding with PureCycle Corporation, the applicant, provided additional history of the project. The original developer had approached PureCycle Corporation, which is a water development company, about providing water to the project. PureCycle Corporation deed-restricted a portion of their water portfolio, so that it would be reserved for Sky Ranch. They were already connected to the property through that deed restriction and ended up purchasing the land interests as well. The purpose of the amendment is to zone the property for current market trends. He described some of the water infrastructure and water conservation measures the community would use.

Alan Cunningham from PCS Group, applicant's representative, showed a potential lot layout for Neighborhood B, which is in the western part of Sky Ranch. The proposal moves the non-residential uses closer to I-70 and increases the number of single-family detached homes in Neighborhood B. He noted that the proposed plan

has more open space and more of a connected central park area than the previous approval.

The Planning Commission asked questions about land dedication for schools, the water system, the neighborhood design, location of nearby commercial, the future I-70 interchange, how water conservation would be enforced, the City of Aurora's letter recommending annexation, affordable housing, and potential chemicals in the water.

The applicant responded they would be dedicating land for two school sites in the project which would appear in later phases. He discussed the various pipelines, aquifers, the PureCycle Corporation water portfolio, and their participation in the WISE project with Aurora and other water providers. As part of the amendment, they did not update all of the neighborhood imagery on the plans but they would require a points system to ensure design diversity. The closest commercial is about 7 miles away on Tower Road and 11 miles away in Bennett but there is the opportunity for retail in this development when more houses are built. The first 525 units can be built without impacts to I-70 or the frontage road; they didn't do an interchange study (1601) because they're only good for 5 years and they didn't think they'd trigger the interchange in that window. They plan to enforce water conservation through water budgets based on irrigation design and projected demand derived from fixture counts in each house. They would also have a tiered rate structure based on that budget, which would incentive conservation. The applicant rebutted Aurora's letter, explaining that they've addressed water resources, that it was more likely Aurora traffic would drive past Sky Ranch to get to I-70 than for Sky Ranch traffic to drive through Aurora to the west, and that the project adheres to MetroVision – just as it did in 2004. The applicant said that *affordable* is a relative term. In today's market with entry level being slightly less than \$300,000, which is hard to deliver with land and materials costs. They would target the upper \$200's to low \$300's segment with 40-60 foot wide lots. The applicant discussed water testing protocols and said they had no hits on arsenic and they hadn't found any hits in their testing for volatile organic and synthetic organic compounds. If 1,4-Dioxane were a concern in this area, the applicant said CDPHE would require testing.

Mr. Rosenberg opened the hearing for public testimony. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

In response to a Planning Commission question, Sue Liu from Engineering Services said significant engineering/drainage concerns

	<p>had been addressed but there are some minor issues to resolve. Neighborhood B is within SEMSWA jurisdiction but other parts of the project are not.</p> <p>It was moved by Mr. Brummel and duly seconded by Mr. Sall, in the case of P16-011, Sky Ranch / Preliminary Plat, that the Planning Commission read the staff report and received testimony at the public hearing and found themselves in agreement with staff findings, including all plans and attachments as set forth in the staff report, dated September 13, 2016, and moved to recommend approval of this case to the Board of County Commissioners, subject to the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant will make minor modifications to the plans and supporting documentation, as identified by Public Works and Development staff, prior to signature of the mylar. 2. The applicant agrees to address all Division of Engineering Services' findings, comments and concerns, as identified within all related Engineering report (s). 3. The applicant will be able to construct 774 residential dwelling units without filing a 1601 process with CDOT. No further development beyond the 774 residential dwelling units will be permitted until completion of the CDOT 1601 process. 4. The applicant agrees to address all SEMSWA's comments and concerns. 5. The applicant agrees to address all UDFCD's (Urban Drainage) comments and concerns. 6. The applicant agrees to address all CDOT's comments and concerns. 7. The applicant agrees to address all Bennett Fire Protection District's comments and concerns. 8. The applicant will provide more water supply and demand information at the Final Plat process. <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Mr. Weiss, Yes; Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Rader, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Mr. Rosenberg, Yes.</p>
<p>Item 1:</p>	<p>Case No. Z16-003, Sky Ranch / Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) – Sherman Feher, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p>

	<p>It was moved by Mr. Brummel and duly seconded by Mr. Weiss, in the case of Z16-003, Sky Ranch / Preliminary Development Plan Amendment, that the Planning Commission read the staff report and received testimony at the public hearing and found themselves in agreement with staff findings, including all plans and attachments as set forth in the staff report, dated September 13, 2016, and moved to recommend approval of this case to the Board of County Commissioners, subject to the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant will make minor modifications to the plans and supporting documentation, as identified by Public Works and Development staff, prior to signature of the mylar. 2. The applicant agrees to address all Division of Engineering Services' findings, comments and concerns, as identified within all related Engineering report (s). 3. The applicant will be able to construct 774 residential dwelling units without filing a 1601 process with CDOT. No further development beyond the 774 residential dwelling units will be permitted until completion of the CDOT 1601 process. 4. The applicant agrees to address all SEMSWA's comments and concerns. 5. The applicant agrees to address all UDFCD's (Urban Drainage) comments and concerns. 6. The applicant agrees to address all CDOT's comments and concerns. 7. The applicant agrees to address all Bennett Fire Protection District's comments and concerns. 8. The applicant will provide more water supply and demand information at the Final Plat process. <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Mr. Weiss, Yes; Ms. Rieck, Yes; Ms. Chaffin, Yes; Mr. Rader, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Mr. Rosenberg, Yes.</p>
ADJOURNMENT	There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.