



**SUMMARY MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION HELD
JULY 21, 2020**

Planning Commission meeting minutes are not an exact transcript and represent key points and the basis of discussion.

1. **CALLED MEETING TO ORDER**– By T.O. Owens at 6:16 P.M.
2. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
3. **ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**

Those present: T.O. Owens, Michael McCarron, Andrew Gay, Doug Magee, Steve Hannan, Patricia Connell

THOSE ABSENT

Mr. Owens moved to excuse Michael P. Griffith from the meeting.

Those voting Yes: Owens, McCarron, Gay, Connell, Magee, Hannan

Those voting No: None

Those absent: Griffith

The motion carried.

ALSO PRESENT: Ryan Stachelski, Director of Community and Economic Development; Rob Smetana, City Planning Manager; Emily Grogg, Sr. Ass't. City Attorney; Jenny Wolfschlag, Manager of Development Engineering; Cheryl Drake, Senior Planner; Linda Hoover, Senior Planner; Sara Hutchinson, Recording Secretary/Administrative Specialist; Josie Suk, Manager of Dev. Systems and Administrative Services

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – July 7, 2020. The minutes stand approved as written.

5. **GENERAL BUSINESS**

None.

6. **REPORTS**

None.

7. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

There being no one wishing to speak, Public Comment was closed.

8. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

DA2020-0022 PUD Development Plan for Arvada TOD South, generally located at 5565 Wadsworth Bypass

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Owens entered into the record the staff report DA2020-0022 dated July 21, 2020, affidavit of mailing and posting log.

Ms. Drake gave a brief introduction of the project. Staff recommends approval.

Ms. Sperling, representative of the applicant, explained the location and context, layout, and design elements of the proposed project. She discussed the retail and hotel positioning, parking, and the activation of the site.

Ms. Lashbrook, applicant, discussed the zoning of the site and the project application process. She discussed the Land Development Code and its application to the proposed design. She explained the design features of the open space and streetscape, retail, and frontage.

Mr. Zadnik, representative of the applicant, discussed the proposed hotel design and amenities.

Mr. Owens opened the hearing for comments from the public.

PUBLIC COMMENT

IN FAVOR

None.

IN OPPOSITION

None.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL

Mr. Owens closed public comment.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION

Mr. Hannan asked Staff how the height of the proposed project compares to the RTD transit hub and the movie theater.

Ms. Drake stated that the RTD transit hub is taller than the proposed structures but that the movie theater is shorter. She explained the grade drop-off from Grandview Avenue to the site of the proposed design.

Mr. Hannan asked about dumpster placement for retail.

Ms. Lashbrook referred to a slide of the presentation to explain the southeastern placement of the retail dumpsters.

Mr. Hannan asked if those in the northern retail building will have to use the dumpsters on the south side of the property.

Ms. Lashbrook confirmed that they will.

Mr. Gay asked about the elevation difference of Grandview Avenue and the proposed design for the hotel.

Ms. Drake stated that she does not have exact numbers, but that she believed that in the design process of the separate proposed project of Olde Town Residences, the Olde Town Residences structures were around 30'. This height was similar to the height of the buildings on the north side of Grandview Avenue.

Ms. Lashbrook confirmed that the Olde Town Residences structures were just over 30' on their northern edge (the highest elevation).

Mr. Smetana mentioned an elevation map used during the Land Development Code update to determine height restrictions. He asked Mr. Gay to clarify which areas he was hoping to compare the elevations of.

Mr. Gay clarified that he believed the elevation of the hotel to be around 5300' and was curious about the comparison to the Grandview Avenue elevation.

Mr. Smetana stated the elevation of Grandview Avenue is roughly 5338'.

Mr. Gay stated that this height is just below the roof of the hotel. He suggested the applicant create a rendering of the hotel from Grandview Avenue for conceptual purposes to portray the view.

Mr. Magee asked about the activation of 56th Avenue and Vance in relation to the proposed residences across the street. He asked why the hotel was not on the southeast corner.

Ms. Lashbrook stated that the hotel activates that corner and that the hotel could not be placed on the southeast corner because of the storm pipe. She stated that the design of the hotel was done to activate the street.

Mr. Magee confirmed his understanding of this choice. He asked about the underground detention systems in terms of their water quality function.

Ms. Wolfschlag explained the isolator rows of the detention systems that assist in settling debris in a way that allows for cleaning.

Mr. Magee stated his appreciation of the landscaping plan for the site. He stated his appreciation for the balance of hardscape and landscape.

MOTION:

It was moved by Mr. McCarron, DA2020-0022, PUD Development Plan for Arvada TOD South, generally located at 5565 Wadsworth Bypass, be recommended to City Council for approval. This motion is based on the findings of fact and approval criteria on Pages 11-12 of the Staff Report.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION DA2020-0022

Ms. Connell stated her appreciation of the multi-use design of the area and the preservation of the view from Olde Town.

The following votes were cast on the motion:

Those voting Yes: Owens, McCarron, Gay, Hannan, Magee, Connell

Those voting No: None

Those absent: Griffith
The motion carried.

DA2020-0051 Major Modification for the Arvada Fire Station #3 Rebuild, generally located 7300 Kipling Street

The public hearing was opened.

Mr. Owens entered into the record the staff report DA2020-0051 dated July 21, 2020, affidavit of mailing and posting log.

Ms. Hoover gave a brief introduction of the project. Staff recommends approval.

Mr. Bonnet, representative of the applicant, discussed the minor modification requests regarding lot coverage, architectural transparency, parking, trash container setbacks, and landscape buffer and fencing.

Mr. Owens opened the hearing for comments from the public.

PUBLIC COMMENT

IN FAVOR

None.

IN OPPOSITION

None.

APPLICANT REBUTTAL

Mr. Owens closed public comment.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMISSION

Mr. Magee asked about the analysis of the fire station that was done last fall.

Mr. Owens stated that the inquiry was outside of the realm of the request for the major modification.

Mr. McCarron asked about the fence with the neighbor to the east of the site. He asked about the appearance of the fence in that area and if the trees will be maintained.

Mr. Bonnet stated that there will not be a retaining wall in that area and that a 6' wrought iron fence would be established to match the neighbor's other fencing. He stated that they will work with the neighbors to have the trees trimmed.

Mr. McCarron stated his concerns for safety.

Ms. Hoover stated that per the Land Development Code, there are several options for buffers with a residential use next to a non-residential use. She stated the concern for the trees along the tree line, as the trees will be lost if a solid fence with brick columns is established. She stated that the iron fence was a compromise with the neighbors.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

July 21, 2020

PAGE 5.

Mr. Ferry, applicant, stated that the trees are on the neighboring site and they don't feel comfortable telling them to remove their trees for the fence.

MOTION:

It was moved by Mr. Magee, DA2020-0051 Major Modification for the Arvada Fire Station #3 Rebuild, generally located at 7300 Kipling Street, be recommended to City Council for approval. This motion is based on the findings of fact and approval criteria on Pages 6-7 of the Staff Report.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION DA2020-0051

Mr. Magee stated his feelings that the modifications are appropriate, that the applicants have been good neighbors in their design, and that the building has an attractive design. He stated his support.

Mr. Gay stated his feelings that the building is essential infrastructure. He stated his support.

Ms. Connell stated her appreciation for the efficiency of the updates.

Mr. Hannan stated his support of the motion. He stated his agreement with Mr. Gay.

The following votes were cast on the motion:

Those voting Yes: Owens, McCarron, Gay, Connell, Magee, Hannan

Those voting No: None

Those absent: Griffith

The motion carried.

Mr. Owens explained that the motions that carried will now be taken to City Council.

8. **OTHER ITEMS**

Mr. Smetana stated that there will be an August 4th meeting for a workshop on the new Land Development Code and a case on the Alternative Sign Program at the Ridge Valley RV site at 53rd and Grey.

Ms. Connell apologized for her late entry into the meeting.

Ms. Suk explained the delivery of the new Land Development Code and Chapters 2 & 5 of the Comprehensive Plan update with the July 21st packets.

9. **ADJOURNED** at 7:28 P.M.

T.O. Owens

T.O. Owens, Chair

Patricia Connell

Patricia Connell, Secretary

Sara Hutchinson

Sara Hutchinson, Recording Secretary