

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
ARAPAHOE COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
TUESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2019**

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>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; Ray Winn, Open Spaces Planner; Roger Harvey, Open Spaces Planning Manager; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Cathleen Valencia, Engineer; Kurtis Cotten, Engineer; Bill Skinner, Senior Planner; Kathleen Hammer, Planner II; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager, and members of the public.</p>
CALL TO ORDER	<p>Chair Rieck 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>
REGULAR ITEMS:	
ITEM 1	<p>Case No. LE18-005, Long’s Pine Grove Location and Extent (L&E) – Kathleen Hammer, Planner II, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>Ms. Hammer introduced the application and established jurisdiction for the public hearing. She stated staff was recommending approval with the conditions outlined in the staff report. She introduced Ray Winn, Open Spaces Planner with the Arapahoe County Open Spaces Department, as the applicant for the case.</p> <p>Mr. Winn presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. He mentioned studies that preceded the master-planning work for the project. He reported the year-long process shaped the design of the park and included extensive public outreach, traffic studies, and presentation of the proposal to the public at the conclusion of the master planning process. Mr. Winn said a web cast of public meetings was made available and surveys were conducted during meetings. He explained the traffic studies and traffic control</p>

were planned in conjunction with City and County of Denver to address bicycle and pedestrian safety connecting to the High Line Canal Trail at the bridge at Florida Avenue. He stated a sidewalk through the park would connect the neighborhood on Uinta with the trail, providing a safer alternative to a Florida crossing. Mr. Winn noted privacy fencing and landscaping to address privacy for an adjoining property.

Jessie Clark with Extreme Landscaping and Architecture explained the gateway entry and garden, internal pedestrian circulation, preservation of as many of the existing pine trees on the site as possible while capitalizing on views from the park, a planned turf area for various activities, and a nature-inspired playground. She explained pine trees and pine cones provided the inspiration for the play equipment, which would be low maintenance. She stated a larger picnic area and shelter were planned, along with some individual picnic sites. She said the passive use was well distributed through the park.

Jesse Clark, applicant/consultant, noted ADA parking spaces, horse-trailer parking for equestrian use of the High Line Canal Trail, and water quality facilities for runoff prior to discharging storm water from the site. He said a crusher-fines “soft” interpretive trail was also planned and a restroom facility would be located near the parking lot.

There were discussions regarding parking, ADA, emergency services requirements, and homes within walking distance to the park.

Ms. Rieck opened the hearing for public comments.

Don Andrews, 8151 E. Iowa Dr., had some concerns with the location of the bike path. He put in a berm on his property, which created a grade change. He asked how his trees and property would be protected. He reported having spruce trees on the berm that were 30 to 40 feet tall with an extensive root system that could be damaged with excavation. He also wanted to know the width of the sidewalk and bike path. He stated other neighbors on Iowa were not aware of the sidewalk/bike path.

Marc Paulicelli, 1514 S Uinta Wy., expressed concern with undermining tall trees on adjoining properties that provided character, noise protection, and privacy for nearby properties.

Robert Murphy, 1564 S Uinta Wy., noted an existing sidewalk and asked whether the sidewalk within the park was really necessary. He was also concerned with loss of any trees on the property that provided privacy and screening of the view of the library.

Schuyer Totman, 8080 E Florida Ave., had questions about the grove at the NW corner of the park. He thought Denver Water open space was going to be landscaped to help provide privacy to his home from the new park use.

Mark Lampert, Four Square Mile Neighborhoods Association (4SMNA), noted the 4SM neighborhoods had been asking for additional park space for a number of years. He reported when the owner of the home on the subject property passed away, the County purchased the property from the family. He said 4SMNA envisioned a neighborhood-level park rather than a destination park. He noted some street-crossing and alignment concerns with the roads and an earlier request for a four-way stop sign. He reported Denver had not been willing to widen the bridge on Florida or make improvements in the Denver ROW to improve safety for trail users. Mr. Lampert reported the meandering path through the park to the trail was included as an alternative to having to cross at Florida and to improve overall safety for neighborhood access to the trail. He noted better lights were needed at stop signs for safety. He said people were failing to stop at Uinta and at the trail crossing on the bridge on Florida. Mr. Lampert said parking was important; however, the desire was for this park to be primarily a neighborhood-oriented park for the 4SM residents.

Celeste Nottingham, said she lived across Florida Ave from the proposed park. She reported the flashing crossing sign at the stop sign lit up her living room and bedroom; she did not want to see the lights become brighter or more prominent.

There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Cathy Valencia, Arapahoe County Engineering Services, Engineer, explained some sidewalks were planned in 2020 that were not part of the LE application.

Jesse Clark, Extreme Architecture, answered the question about additional plantings planned for the County property, but noted there were constraints on the Denver Water Board property for enhancing landscaping, in the triangle noted by an adjoining property owner. He offered to follow up with the owner and show him a planting plan.

	<p>There were discussions regarding fencing, who would be responsible for maintaining the property, and the plan for sidewalk installation.</p> <p>It was moved by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Ms. Wollman, in the case of LE18-004, Long’s Pine Grove Open Space / Location and Extent, 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 move to approve the application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prior to the signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns. <p>The vote was:</p> <p>Ms. Rieck, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.</p>
<p>ITEM 2</p>	<p>Case No. GDP18-004, Copperleaf Parcel J / Preliminary Development Plan 7th Amendment – Bill Skinner, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)</p> <p>Bill Skinner, Senior Planner, introduced the application and noted a date error on the posting form for the sign. He reported having seen the sign on the property.</p> <p>Mr. Hill asked that the applicant state, for the record, the date of the sign posting and that it had been posted continuously up to the date of today’s hearing.</p> <p>The applicant confirmed that the sign was posted continuously from December 18, 2018 and that he would correct the posting form for the record and provide it to Mr. Skinner in the morning.</p> <p>Mr. Skinner explained the changes proposed in building separation distances for Parcel J from 15 feet (approved in 2004) to six feet, did not impact building setbacks from the property line. He said this would be comparable to building separations between parcels (each with a three-foot building setback, adding up to a six-foot separation) that were in place nearby within Copperleaf. He stated the applicant was directed that the change to six feet for building separation would be only for single-family detached homes. Mr. Skinner explained, if</p>

another product type was built in the future, the building separation would continue to be 15 feet.

There were discussions regarding the fire district response occurring during the site plan part of the process, building code issues, and a similar project in Centennial.

Ryan McBreen, Norris Design, as the applicant's representative, gave some geographic perspective for Parcel J within the Copperleaf development. He confirmed the building separation would apply only for single-family detached housing and the plan set would be updated with that note. He noted this would expand a housing type available within Copperleaf. Mr. McBreen explained the housing type had been around since the Civil War and was not "new" for housing within the U.S. Mr. McBreen explained the types of development, including multi-family and commercial, near the parcel. He reported the applicant felt the housing type was a good addition in the area of the project. He noted Richard Frank, Century Communities, was present to answer questions.

There were discussions regarding building separations with respect to alleyways and setbacks. The Cityscapes project in Centennial was considered. It was noted the homes were similar to townhomes, but were separated by six feet rather than being attached. It was noted the product had been built around the metro area, including Littleton and Centennial.

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

There were continued discussions regarding density and a comparison of the proposed project to the existing Cityscapes off Broncos Parkway.

Mr. Frank believed there were approximately 140 units total, which was a reduction in previously approved density for the parcel.

It was moved by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Mr. Sall, in the case of GDP18-004, Copperleaf Parcel J / Preliminary Development Plan 7th Amendment, that the Planning Commission reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, listened to the applicant's presentation and 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 condition:

	<p>1. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant will address all Public Works and Development Department Staff comments.</p> <p>Ms. Rieck, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.</p>
ADJOURNMENT	<p>There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned.</p>