



## **PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

**November 4, 2021**

Planning Commission Chairman Gary Poole called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

The Planning Commission and audience joined in saying the Pledge of Allegiance.

Also, present and seated were Commissioners Richard Foerster, Nicholas Metz, Ruth Ann Nelson, Roxy Colette and Kim Rodell.

### **ADDITIONS TO OR DELETIONS FROM THE AGENDA**

None

### **OPENING REMARKS**

Planning Commission Chairman Gary Poole: Thank you for attending the Parker Planning Commission meeting tonight. Before the meeting begins, there are two ways to make public comments on any item at this hearing. Comments may be made in person at the public hearing tonight or you can join the Zoom webinar link posted on the Town's website at [www.ParkerOnline.org/PlanningCommission](http://www.ParkerOnline.org/PlanningCommission).

Facebook Live participants are only able to view and listen to the meeting and are unable to submit public comment on agenda items. If you are on Facebook Live and wish to submit public comment on an item tonight, now would be a good time to leave Facebook Live and join the Planning Commission meeting on Zoom.

For Zoom participants that wish to comment on any agenda item, use the Zoom" Raise Your Hand" feature when I open the hearing up for public comment.

We appreciate your attendance and participation at the Planning Commission.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

None

### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED: 7:08 P.M. – DOUGLAS COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT PINE DRIVE CAMPUS**

The project applicant, Leela Rajasekar, Douglas County School District, is proposing to rezone their property from PD to Public Facilities, TRAKiT No. Z21-005. The site is located on the west side of Pine Drive south of Hills Drive.

Department: Community Development, Stacey Nerger

Stacey Nerger, Senior Planner, presented the staff report for Pine Drive Property – Zoning to PF-Public Facilities. Ms. Nerger concluded with the determinations in the staff report that the Planning Commission recommend Town Council approve the zoning.

Commissioners discussed with staff:

- Will the Town be rezoning one property and zoning for the first time the annexed property and this will be done through one, single motion; *(staff said yes)*.
- When will the Planning Commission be seeing the minor development plat; *(staff invited the applicant to step forward and address this question. Derrick Stertz, Planning Manager for Douglas County School District (resides at 3744 South Pitkin Circle, Aurora, CO) and Andy Abner Deputy Superintendent (resides at 7024 Chatford Court, Castle Pines, CO) said they plan to review their budgetary constraints and that after a short delay they hope to get new direction from the Board of Education)*.

#### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Staff Presentation only.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT OPENED**

None

#### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED: 7:14 P.M. - 1. PINE DRIVE PROPERTY – ZONING TO PF-PUBLIC FACILITIES**

#### **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioners commented that the zoning is appropriate and is pleased to see the larger parcel being pulled out of the PD and being made specific for public facilities.

Commissioner Richard Foerster moved the Planning Commission recommend Town Council approve the zoning. Commissioner Nicholas Metz seconded; a vote was taken and was passed unanimously.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING OPENED: 7:16 P.M. – KIME RANCH - ZONING**

The applicant, PCS Group, on behalf of the owner, Century Land Holdings LLC., proposes to annex 7.5 acres of undeveloped land along East Mainstreet into the Town of Parker. The subject land will be consolidated with an adjoining 35.41-acre parcel known as Kime Ranch that is already in the Town. The combined 42.91-acre site is proposed to be zoned Planned Development (PD) for residential use with a maximum 150 single-family residential lots, TRAKiT No.: Z21-007. The site is located on the north side of Mainstreet at Willow Park Drive.

Department: Community Development, Julia Duncan

Julia Duncan, Associate Planner, presented the staff report for Kime Ranch - Zoning. Ms. Duncan concluded with the determinations in the staff report that the Planning Commission recommend Town Council approve the zoning.

Commissioners discussed with staff:

- Commissioner asked if there is there a percentage in the Master Plan of land that will remain or be retained as zoned agricultural; *(staff said that the Master Plan does not allocate percentages for any specific land use type, but we do have a percentage allocation required by code for open space and this proposal is consistent with that required allocation of open space which is twenty percent).*

### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Paul Shoukas with PCS Group presented project information:

- Introduced partner companies; JR Engineering (civil engineer) and Century Communities (builder/developer)
- Provided a brief history on the property
- Thanked Parker staff for assistance in this proposal
- Restated the proposal being made tonight (annex 7.5 acres into the Town and Rezone 42.9 acres from AG and Rural Residential to PD), and provided additional information about the proposal.

Commissioners discussed with applicant:

None

### **PUBLIC COMMENT OPENED**

Chris Cressy who resides at 7654 Lark Dr., Parker, CO, lives in the area to the north of the project in unincorporated Douglas County, comments were as follows:

- that the plans are not consistent with her neighborhood of 2.5 acre lots;
- that the setback of 41 feet seems close;
- drainage seems to be an issue and;
- it appears that there will be a road to connect to her subdivision, Pine Valley.

Michael and Joanna Floyd who reside at 7786 Lark Dr., Parker, CO, also owns the two properties between their home and Chris Cressy's home, comments were as follows:

- asked for a larger buffer between their home and the new subdivision;
- asked for larger size lots, noted these proposed lots are smaller than those to the east and the west; and
- they are also concerned that it looks like Thrush Dr. will be connected to the new subdivision.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

- Commissioners asked if the road will be connected; *(Tyler Sandt, Engineering Department, said the road idea was previously considered, but was scrapped, and there are no plans to connect that road. Staff added that in the upcoming sketch and preliminary plans, there are no plans to connect the road.)*
- Commissioners asked if setbacks will be finalized at sketch and preliminary; *(staff said that a public hearing will be held before Planning Commission and Town Council for the sketch and preliminary plan where setbacks and buffers will be finalized and they will range between 40 and 70 feet along the northern boundary).*
- Commissioners asked for clarification on density to the east and west of this proposed development; *(staff said the Medium Density Residential Character area in our master plan recommends a maximum density of 3.5 dwellings per acre, this parcel is 42.91 acres which equates to a maximum of 150 dwelling unit, how those dwelling units are located on the site is determined at sketch and preliminary plan, the proposed PD does allow for a minimum 5,500 sq. ft. lot size, the PDs to the east, west and south allow for a range of 3,000 to 6,000 sq. ft. minimum lot size and the plats developed lots start around 6,400 sq. ft.).*
- Commissioners requested clarification that because this development is going to have a higher level of open space and parks than the neighboring developments do, that's going to result in creating a little bit smaller lots for the homes themselves which preserves more open space in the development overall, is that correct; *(staff said that would be a logical deduction because there is a 20% allocation to open space and over 3 acres of park space which equates to over 8% as compared the adjacent PDs which were only required to provide 10% open space and park space combined).*
- Commissioners stated that this is only for zoning, but can the developer address the drainage at the top of the hill and if the developer plans to meet with the folks to the north to discuss the setbacks issues; *(Tyler Sandt, Engineering Department, said that Town engineering criteria does not allow them to convey any more surface runoff than what was historically already there, also the lot in general drains from north to south so the flow would drain away from those lots and they are proposing backlot swales which would also help convey the flows. The applicant said they will have ongoing discussions with the northern residents regarding their concerns).*
- Commissioners asked about the swales for the runoff, will that be going into retention ponds created in the subdivision; *(Tyler Sandt, Engineering Department, said the applicant is proposing a detention pond at the south end of their site which all the generated runoff will be conveyed to).*

## **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED: 7:52 P.M. - KIME RANCH - ZONING**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioners said the zoning makes sense based on:

- compatibility with surrounding medium residential developments,
- that it is appropriate zoning for that space;
- meets all the criteria for zoning; and
- that they appreciate the applicant reaching out to the residents to the north and that growth is inevitable.

Commissioner Richard Foerster moved the Planning Commission recommend Town Council approve the zoning. Commissioner Nicholas Metz seconded; a vote was taken and was passed unanimously.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED: 7:55 P.M. - TOWNHOMES AT PINE DRIVE - SKETCH AND PRELIMINARY PLAN**

**The applicant, M&B Construction, is proposing a Sketch and Preliminary Plan to create lots for 85 townhome units with associated open space, landscaping and parks and to create a 2.399-acre commercial tract for future development. The site is generally located on Summerset Lane east of Pine Drive, TRAKiT No.: SUB20-043 and SUB20-044.**

Department: Community Development, Stacey Nerger

Stacey Nerger, Senior Planner, presented the staff report for the Townhomes at Pine Drive – Sketch and Preliminary Plan. Ms. Nerger concluded with the determinations in the staff report that the Planning Commission recommend Town Council approve the Sketch and Preliminary Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. All Final Plats shall be substantially similar in design and layout and the inclusion of amenities to this Preliminary Plan, as determined by Town staff.
2. The applicant shall add the required Xcel easements to the Final Plat.
3. The applicant shall continue to work with Douglas County on street names and addresses which will be finalized at the time of any Final Plats for the property.
4. The applicant shall meet required setbacks, stagger and zoning as stated within the Parker Land Development Ordinance.

Commissioners discussed with staff:

- Commissioners asked how much lower are these homes compared to the single family homes to the east; *(staff said it varies as you go north to south, but it ranges with the maximum difference at about 20 feet lower than existing homes).*
- Commissioners asked what is the maximum height of the townhomes; *(staff said the maximum height that is written into the zone district is 35 feet or it is based on 15 feet above the centerline of the road that is in Parker Vista. A surveyor surveyed the mid-point of that road and they can go 15 above that point.)*
- Commissioners pointed out that this property was originally Douglas County and was out of the Master Plan and was annexed into to the Town; *(staff said that this property was*

*annexed and zoned into the Town in 2018 and it was part of the Master Plan at that time).*

- Commissioners pointed out that when looking at the plan it was difficult to see where the guest parking would be, and that you could anticipate two cars for every unit, and are the units being built with garages, will there be guest parking areas, question about the parks being little, are they going to useable, when does the traffic light go in, when the homes are built or do we have to what for appropriate warrants; *(staff said parking will be reviewed at the time of the site plan, but it is something we have to look as we are laying out the site, the applicant is proposing to have attached two car garage. Per the Town's LDO, two parking spaces are required per unit plus one parking space for every four units; concerning useable parks within a long, narrow parcel, the developer has created useable, themed spaces, around the site, mile markers will be placed with workout stations, as you go around and gain elevation there will be an incline to create a workout scenario, the dog park is located in there as well and then central will be the family oriented park. Tyler Sandt, Engineering Department, said in regards to the traffic signal and per the annexation agreement they had to pay for a quarter of the signal as well as the Summerset Lane improvements and the traffic signal will go in when the warrants are met).*
- Commissioners asked what the threshold is for the warrants for the traffic signal at that intersection, because at some point the convenience store and gas station will go in and you're going to have all those kids across the street that are will want to go across Pine Drive to go buy their snacks, what level of traffic meets the warrant for that traffic signal; *(Tyler Sandt, Engineering Department, said that there are several different warrants and anyone of them being met would warrant a traffic signal, such as traffic volume, or pedestrian volume).*

### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION**

Chuck Micale, who resides at 3094 Aspen Creek Drive, Highlands Ranch, CO, offered to answer any questions the planning commissioners may have, thanked staff, discussed traffic and believes that this development will not be a burden prior to signalization.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT OPENED**

Alyson Lauritzen, who resides at 10755 Pikeview Lane, Parker, CO, who lives right behind where you will be building,

- asked for consideration concerning the grade from Pine Drive to Pikeview Lane, if the property could be leveled out,
- concerned that if the townhomes are built 15 feet above the road mid-point of Pikeview Lane, they would obstruct views.
- asked about landscaping, would the trees that are being put in be taller than the houses, because that obstructs our view as well.
- asked if the buffer behind the fence line 65 feet and are we looking at a park?
- asked if they were backing up to and looking at a bunch of garages.

Darcy Otremba, who resides at 10757 Pikeview Lane, Parker CO, moved in 24 years ago prior to this property being annexed into the Town and

- paid a premium for the views.
- There were agreements made about the heights of whatever is built there and how it is not to take from our view and what exactly is going to be in our backyard,
- Asked what they will we be looking at.
- asked about the Town's plan with these different developments, the Kime Ranch, the Douglas County alternative High School, this new property with the housing and the commercial,
- what is the plan with the Town for the amount of housing and influx of people that are going to be driving on these small roads coming out of the east side of Town?
- concerned about traffic, with no increase or expansion of roads and provided an example, today, driving north on Pine Drive there was an accident going into Parker Core Knowledge.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT CLOSED**

### **PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED: 8:23 P.M. – TOWNHOMES AT PINE DRIVE - SKETCH AND PRELIMINARY PLAN**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

- Commissioners asked staff to respond to the commenters; *(staff said the developer will have to level out the property slightly, there will still be some elevation as you go from west to east on the property. One of the stipulations from the modified zoning is that you can't go 15 feet above Pikeview Lane pavement elevation which is 5,971 feet in elevation. The applicant is aware of this and the applicant will need to address this during the site plan.*
- Commissioners asked how far above the midline of the road are the homes of the people who have commented tonight, are the commenter's home above or below the midline of the road; *(staff said we did not survey the homes, but typically homes sit above that elevation line for drainage. The reason for the 15 feet was a result of the applicant listening to the neighbors during the annexation of the property trying to protect the views, which may still block the view of the first floor, but it would keep the second story views of those homes. The other stipulation had to do with the 65-foot buffer on the east and is from the property line of the Townhomes at Pine Lane property and there is a little bit of a buffer owned by the HOA to the east and per zoning, they are allowed to put parks, open space and landscaping in that area, but no structures).*
- Commissioners asked if there would be Cottonwood trees or if trees were going to be planted that was going to exacerbate the issue with the views; *(staff said Cottonwood trees are not permitted as landscaping in the Town, per code a landscape buffer is required based off the adjacent use which is residential, one tree and five shrubs per 25 linear feet, which includes no less than 40% and no more than 60% evergreen trees when planted will be between 6-8 feet in height, and trees will grow over time, and).*

- Commissioners asked if a landscape plan can be made that includes trees that are not destined to be too tall; *(staff said that is an option and that all landscaping will be reviewed at the time of the site plan, and encourages the neighbors that back up to this development to reach out to the developer and talk about species and how they will look behind their houses to ensure that their views are protected).*
- Commissioners noted that an additional benefit would be that the trees would hide the garages; *(staff said the garages will face internal, no garages will face towards the existing homes).*
- Commissioners asked for information on the commenters traffic question; *(Tyler Sandt, Engineering Department, noted the road is an arterial designed as a traffic collector and it is not at capacity for an arterial, concerning the future, each development has to do a traffic study, propose and pay for improvements, the Town is proactive and works towards solutions before problems occur.*
- Commissioners asked what the radius of the traffic study; *(Tyler Sandt, Engineering Department, said there is no hard set criteria, they take traffic counts on Pine before they do the study which includes traffic coming and going from Core Knowledge which includes the surrounding areas known as background traffic and they apply their site generated traffic to what's already existing and that's how they propose improvements).*
- Commissioners asked about Hills Drive that is proposed to be realigned with the School District Property to the north and if this realignment was considered in the traffic study;; *(Tyler Sandt, Engineering Department said for the school, Hills Drive was shifted to the south to create a proper intersection, which would not relieve pressure from Pine Drive. Staff added that the Town does have a Transportation Master Plan, our Engineering Department does do traffic projections and analysis on a regular basis and the Town's Master Plan is aligned with the Transportation plan).*
- Commissioners asked about the 65 foot buffer that will be used for trails and a park, will that be open and accessible to the neighbors to the east; *(staff said it will not have a connection point to the existing neighborhood, but that by code 50% of the parks need to be open to the public, not gated, not key-coded, all the park amenities in this development would be open to the public).*

Commissioners thanked everyone for their comments, that growth is inevitable and is tough to watch, encouraged the developer to continue to talk to the neighbors and adhere to the code, encouraged the public to attend these meetings and give their opinion, that initial concerns regarding parking, parks, traffic and views were addressed in the initial agreement and it fits in with the master plan.

Commissioner Ruth Ann Nelson moved the Planning Commission recommend Town Council approve the zoning. Commissioner Richard Foerster seconded; a vote was taken and was passed

unanimously.

### **PLANNING COMMISSION ITEMS**

#### **Special Planning Commission Meeting – 11.18.21**

Bryce Matthews discussed with the Commissioners that a number of items will be coming up for public hearing towards the end of the year, that we typically only have one Planning Commission Meeting in November because of the holidays and because of the number projects coming up, staff is requesting a Special Planning Commission Meeting on 11.18.21.

Commissioner Richard Foerster moved to set a Special Planning Commission Meeting on 11.18.21. Commissioner Roxy Colette seconded; a vote was taken and was passed unanimously.

### **STAFF ITEMS**

#### **Approval of 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Dates**

Commissioner Ruth Ann Nelson moved to approve the 2022 Planning Commission Meeting dates. Commissioner Richard Foerster seconded; a vote was taken and was passed unanimously.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Ruth Ann Nelson moved that the meeting be closed. Commissioner Roxy Colette seconded the motion and was passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m.



Jeff Miller  
Recording Secretary



Gary Poole  
Chair