

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, JANUARY 8, 2018**

<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 were in attendance:</p> <p>Mark Brummel; Jane Rieck, Chair; Richard Sall, Kathryn Latsis, Jamie Wollman, and Randall Miller.</p> <p>Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Asst. County Attorney; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Sarah L. White, Engineer; Kathleen Hammer, Planner II; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; and members of the public.</p>
<b>CALL TO ORDER</b>	<p>Chair Rieck 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 Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Ms. Latsis to accept the minutes from the December 18, 2018 Planning Commission meeting, as amended, to revise ‘address’ to read ‘addressed’ on page 7, paragraph 2.</b></p> <p><b>The motion passed unanimously.</b></p>
<b>REGULAR ITEMS:</b>	
<b>ITEM 1</b>	<p><b>Case No. SDPZ18-001, Main Street Villas / Specific Development Plan with Zoning (SDPZ) – Kat Hammer, Planner II, Public Works and Development (PWD)</b></p> <p>Ms. Hammer introduced the case and established jurisdiction. She reported the application proposed eight (8) attached residential buildings with a total of sixteen (16) units. She stated the maximum building height proposed was 55 feet; however, staff proposed 35 foot maximum height and three stories. She also recommended a revised condition of approval, specifying that the money for the</p>

sidewalks be provided by the applicant at the time of the Administrative Site Plan (ASP) submittal.

Jennifer Carpenter, LEI Design Group, provided a summary of the proposed housing project, which they believed would be a product for teachers or somebody wanting to downsize. She asked that condition 2, contribution towards the sidewalk, be removed. Ms. Carpenter stated the developer would pay their share at the time the sidewalk was warranted by the County. She explained they followed Section 6-300 of the Land Development Code (LDC) for moderate density where 55' height or four story height was maximum. She said, while the library intended to purchase the site, they might not, and they didn't want to have to come back during the ASP process, not knowing what the future design might be.

There were discussions regarding the sidewalk and various options related to delaying payment toward the construction, other sidewalks in the area, how best to ensure the work was completed and possible funding mechanisms. There were discussions concerning the building height maximum, lot sizes in comparison to adjacent subdivisions, the subarea plan, and building heights.

Mr. Haskins reported the applicant had applied for a variance to the curb/gutter/sidewalk and the TRC committee approved the curb and gutter, because of the character around it. He explained that because the proposal was denser, staff wanted to ensure sidewalk money was available; however, if the Planning Commission (PC) determined a sidewalk was an appropriate installation in Byers, they could incorporate that into the conditions of approval. Mr. Haskins stated staff believed having a sidewalk to the future library would be nice to have. He explained normally they would meet with the applicant to discuss, but they haven't had a chance to do that yet.

Ms. Rieck opened the hearing for public comments. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Ms. Carpenter said Bradbury was willing to pay for the sidewalk when the time came. She explained they got the curb/gutter waived because of nonconforming roadway. She said if they installed the sidewalk now, there might be safety issues. Ms. Carpenter said the applicant would like to put something on the SDP or in an agreement that when the sidewalk did come, they were willing to pay their share for the lot.

**It was moved by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Mr. Miller, in the case of Case No. SDPZ18-001, Main Street Villas / Specific**

	<p><b>Development Plan, that the Planning Commission reviewed the staff report including all exhibits and attachments, listened to the applicant’s presentation and any public comment as presented at the hearing, and moved to recommend approval of the application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Prior to the signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns.</b></li> <li><b>2. The developer shall contribute funds for future sidewalk construction, based on a cost estimate of construction.</b></li> <li><b>3. The maximum building height for Lot 1 and Lot 2 shall not exceed 35 feet and be restricted to 3 stories.</b></li> <li><b>4. The development shall meet all Byers Fire District design requirements.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>The vote was:</b></p> <p><b>Ms. Rieck, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.</b></p>
<p><b>ITEM 2</b></p>	<p><b>Case No PM18-004, Main Street Villas / Minor Subdivision (MS) – Kat Hammer, Planner II, Public Works and Development (PWD)</b></p> <p>Ms. Hammer introduced the case and established jurisdiction for the Planning Commission (PC) to proceed. She provided a brief summary of the project and explained it was a request to replat one lot into two lots. She stated the plat would require sidewalks at the Administrative Site Plan (ASP) process and payment of cash-in-lieu of land dedication. Ms. Hammer said staff was recommending approval with the five conditions listed in the staff report.</p> <p>Stephanie Stewart, applicant, restated their request to delay sidewalks until the ASP and reminded the PC there was no sunset on how long funds could be held by the County. She directed everyone’s attention to condition 5, which was related to cash-in-lieu amounts. She said they had come up with \$6,954.00 for schools, based on Main Street Villas lot.</p> <p>Ms. Hammer said she would double check the numbers but the County used assumed value method to calculate cash-in-lieu.</p>

	<p>Ms. Rieck opened the hearing for public comments. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.</p> <p><b>It was moved by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Ms. Wollman, in the case of Case No. PM18-004, Main Street Villas / Minor Subdivision, that the Planning Commission reviewed the staff report including all exhibits and attachments, listened to the applicant’s presentation and any public comment as presented at the hearing, and moved to recommend approval of the application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Prior to the signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns.</b></li> <li><b>2. Approval of PM18-004, Main Street Villas- Minor Subdivision is contingent on the approval of SDPZ18-001, Main Street Villas – Specific Development Plan.</b></li> <li><b>3. The developer will contribute funds for future sidewalk construction, based on a cost estimate of construction.</b></li> <li><b>4. The development shall meet all Byers Fire District design requirements.</b></li> <li><b>5. The applicant shall pay a cash-in-lieu of public land dedication prior to recording of the plat: Schools: \$14,805.60, Parks: \$5,683.20, and Other Public Purposes: \$236.80.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>The vote was:</b></p> <p><b>Ms. Rieck, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.</b></p>
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.