**Summary of Planning and Zoning Commission Votes**  
**Regular Meeting of the Aurora Colorado Planning Commission**  
**December 9, 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Plg Dept Recom</th>
<th>Plg Comm Action*</th>
<th>Est. City Council Schedule**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5a.          | **UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE – UDO AMENDMENT** (All Wards)  
CASE MANAGER: Karen Hancock  
APPLICANT: City of Aurora Planning & Dev Serv  
Development Application: DA-2163-06  
Case Number: 2018-1006-05  
General Location: Within the boundaries of the City | Recommend approval | Recommended Approval  
For Approval: 7  
For Denial: 0  
Abstentions: 0  
Absent: 0 | City Council meeting date  
Jan 11, 2021 |
| 5b.          | **ROSS AT GARDENS ON HAVANA – SIGN ADJUSTMENT** (Ward IV)  
CASE MANAGER: Dan Osoba  
APPLICANT: Wilson Gardens Havana LLC  
Development Application: DA-1608-17  
Case Number: 2011-6022-04  
General Location: Southwest Corner of Joliet Street and Mississippi Avenue | Approve w/ conditions | Denied  
For Approval: 0  
For Denial: 7  
Abstentions: 0  
Absent: 0 | Call-up deadline  
Jan 11, 2021 |
| 5c.          | **HIGH POINT – HYDE INDUSTRIAL – ZONING MAP AMENDMENT** (Ward II)  
CASE MANAGER: Deborah Bickmire  
APPLICANT: Hyde Development  
Development Application: DA-2233-00  
Case Number: 2020-2002-00  
General Location: South of 64th Avenue between E-470 and Denali Street | Recommend approval | Recommended Approval  
For Approval: 7  
For Denial: 0  
Abstentions: 0  
Absent: 0 | City Council meeting date  
Jan 25, 2021 |
| 5d.          | **THE POINT AT NINE MILE MULTI-FAMILY – SITE PLAN** (Ward IV)  
CASE MANAGER: Heather Lamboy  
APPLICANT: Mile High Development  
Development Application: DA-2061-07  
Case Number: 2020-4019-00  
General Location: Northeast Corner of S Parker Road and S Quari Street  
Condition:  
1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan and the issuance of building permits. | Approve w/ a condition | Approved w/ a condition  
For Approval: 7  
For Denial: 0  
Abstentions: 0  
Absent: 0 | Call-up deadline  
Jan 11, 2021 |

**PLEASE NOTE:** Planning Commission approvals and denials are always listed in terms of the APPLICANT’S original request, regardless of whether the Commission’s motion was phrased as a motion to approve or to deny. For example, Commission members voting FOR a motion to ACHIEVdeny approval are listed as voting for “denial”.  
**City Council hearing dates listed are preliminary—final dates may be subject to change.**
As the result of a proposed project in the 60 LDN noise contour for Buckley Garrison, staff became aware of remnant text carried over from the old Zoning Code during drafting of the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). The remnant text was only carried over to one of the three noise contour subareas in Section 146-2.6.2.a. The city of Aurora community is affected by aircraft operations from the following airports:

- Commercial Airport---Denver International Airport
- General Aviation Airport---Front Range Airport and future Colorado Air and Spaceport
- General Aviation Airport---Centennial Airport
- Military Airport---Buckley Garrison

In the old Zoning Code, all three types of airports had requirements described in three different code sections. Working with stakeholders from all airports, staff asked the code consultant to combine and streamline the separate sections into one consistent set of standards for the airport influence districts at all four airports. Descriptions for each separate type of airport were replaced with “involved airport” for a more inclusive approach. In the description of the 60 LDN subarea, the words “general aviation” were not deleted.

This item is a proposed text amendment to delete the words “general aviation” so that the description is consistent with the other subareas which is “involved airport.”

Development application is applicable to the incorporated city boundaries. No public comments were received.

If the correction is not approved, the city may not be in compliance with an existing intergovernmental agreement between Adams County and Denver International Airport. Additionally, the amendment will help protect Buckley Garrison from residential development that may not be compatible with future aircraft operations.

Testimony Given at the Hearing:

Karen Hancock, Case Manager, gave a presentation of the item, including the staff recommendation.

Commissioner Hogan asked if all four airports were notified. Ms. Hancock answered that staff had a discussion about the correction with staff at Buckley Garrison. The other airports were not contacted because they assumed that these requirements were already in place. Commissioner Hogan stated that it would be prudent to let the other airports know of the correction.

Chairman Lyon asked if this item would go before City Council. Ms. Hancock answered yes and staff would like to take the Commissioner’s recommendation.

There was no public comment.
Planning Commission Results

Agenda Item 5a – Unified Development Ordinance Text Amendment

A motion was made Commissioner Giaser and seconded by Commissioner Jetchick.

Further Discussion:
No further discussion occurred.

Action Taken:  Recommended Approval
Votes for the UDO Text Amendment:  7
Votes against the UDO Text Amendment:  0
Absent:  None
Abstaining:  None

Filed: K:\$DA\2163-06sps.rtf
SUMMARY OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

Project Name:  ROSS AT GARDENS ON HAVANA
Planning Commission Hearing Date: December 9, 2020
Deadline for Applicant Appeal: December 19, 2020
Deadline for City Council Call Up: January 11, 2021
Ward:     Ward IV
Project Type: Sign Adjustment
DA Number:   DA-1608-17
Case Number: 2011-6022-04
Location:   QS:11C – Southwest Corner of Joliet Street and Mississippi Avenue
Case Manager:   Dan Osoba

Description:
The applicant, Signarama Denver, is proposing a major adjustment to allow increased sign area for an individual tenant located within the Gardens on Havana. The applicant is requesting this adjustment on behalf of their client Ross Stores, the tenant at 1150 S. Ironton St, Unit 101, Aurora, CO 80012. This tenant space is 25,000 s.f. and located approximately 500-feet east of the intersection of E. Mississippi Ave and S. Havana St.

The adjustment request is to increase the maximum sign size from 200 square-feet to 381 square-feet of wall signage on the primary façade (west elevation) and permit a single sign greater than 200 square-feet. Additionally, the letter height on the secondary (east) frontage is requested to be increased from 48-inches per the zoning requirement to 60-inches. The maximum signage area and single sign size are regulated by the Gardens on Havana Master Sign Program, which was approved in conjunction with the Master Plan for the shopping center in 2007. The Master Sign Plan is consistent with City standards and regulations; however, larger allowances are permitted on “big-box” anchor tenants. On standards and regulations where the Master Sign Plan is silent, the Unified Development Ordinance shall be the regulating document.

Referrals were sent to ten abutting property owners and nine registered neighborhood organizations. The owner of the shopping center, Wilson Gardens Havana, LLC (AmCap) has reviewed the proposed sign plans and issued a letter of support for the adjustment request. Comments were received from the Village East Neighborhood Association in opposition to this proposal citing the necessity of the larger sign, precedent for other stores in the center, architectural and design concerns, and former community feedback and involvement in the original Master Sign Plan. The following concerns are listed verbatim below:

1. It is not necessary to draw shoppers to the store because they will see the store advertised on the Gardens on Havana signs on the street and as they drive through the center on S. Ironton St.
2. It will set a precedent for stores to be on the yet developed sites or for a future occupant of one of the existing stores.
3. The uniformity of the size of the signs based on a percentage of the size of the façade results in a more eye pleasing architectural feature of the each of the stores, rather than having a hodge podge of differing signage coverages.
4. They are asking for a 90% variance which will make the signage architecturally unpleasing compared to all the other signage in the Gardens on Havana.
5. VENA was intimately involved throughout the entire development of the Gardens on Havana, including the signage. We would be saddened to see the goodwill built between the original landowner, Gary Paschel, and the original developer and management company Miller Weingarten destroyed.
6. We believe Ross is a destination store and people will still shop there if the sign was smaller than permitted. We would like to know why the property management company changed their comment of disapproval when this first came up a few months ago to approval now. Did they ask the existing business owners in the Gardens on Havana for their opinion on this Development Application?

No neighborhood meeting was held prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission after discussion with the representative from the neighborhood organization, Arnie Shultz. In lieu of this meeting, Mr. Shultz agreed to discuss the proposal and the neighborhood concerns at the public hearing.

The Gardens on Havana Master Sign Plan allows 2 square feet of signage per 100 linear feet of frontage on the primary and secondary elevations. The proposed Ross store has 100 linear feet of frontage, which would permit 200 total square feet of signage. The applicant originally requested a 90.5% increase to this amount proposing up to 381 total square feet of signage. The criteria for approval used in this analysis state that the adjustment may not have a material impact on abutting lots, it does not violate previous conditions of approval, and it will have a minimal impact on surrounding neighborhoods and is requested due to site constraints such as irregular or unusual site size, shape, or orientation. In this case, the tenant space is not irregular or unusual compared to the rest of the Gardens on Havana shopping center anchor spaces or pad sites. Additionally, the applicant indicated the request for the sign adjustment was to increase visibility for the Ross store as it is setback approximately 500 feet from S. Havana Street. There are Gardens on Havana multi-tenant business identification signs located along the periphery of the center that contain Ross placards, which already provide visibility for the tenant on the adjacent arterial streets. Based on this analysis, the staff finding for the originally proposed sign plans was that the proposal did not comply with the criteria for approval. However, staff has provided a list of recommended conditions of approval to bring the proposal into compliance with the Criteria for Approval by reducing the sign size, allowing only one sign on the primary elevation, and reducing the letter height on the secondary façade to be consistent with the rest of the center.

After reviewing the staff report and recommendations, the applicant, Ross, and the Gardens on Havana ownership have agreed to the acceptability of the recommended conditions of approval as stated in the staff report and provided updated sign plans in compliance with these conditions. The updated plans were sent to the Planning and Zoning Commission and interested parties prior to the hearing on December 9, 2020. The updated sign plan shows the primary west facing façade with only one sign, and with the total sign area reduced from 381 square feet to 271 square feet. The updated sign plan shows the secondary east facing façade with a reduced sign size from 100 square feet to 64 square feet and a letter height decrease from 60” to 48”. Staff has reviewed these updated sign plans and determined that they would comply with the recommended conditions of approval as stated in the staff report. The remaining adjustment requests necessary based on the staff recommended conditions of approval include an increase in maximum sign area from 200 square feet to 271 square feet, and an increase in the maximum single sign size from 200 square feet to 271 square feet.

Testimony Given at the Hearing:
Planning Case Manager Dan Osoba gave a presentation on the agenda item.

Commissioner Bengen asked staff if the representatives from Gardens on Havana approve of the adjustments.

Mr. Osoba indicated that to his knowledge the Gardens on Havana ownership approve of the adjustments.

Chairman Lyon asked the applicant to confirm that the representatives from Gardens on Havana approve of the adjustments.

Dan Rodriguez, Signarama Denver, 2200 S Monaco Pkwy, Unit I, Denver, CO confirmed that the Gardens on Havana have issued a signed approval for the adjustment requests.

Arnie Shultz, 1137 S Oakland St, Aurora, CO, representing Village East Neighborhood Association (VENA), spoke in opposition to the sign adjustments. The VENA Board of Commissioners have voted unanimously against this application as indicated in the staff report and Planning Commission packet.
The VENA board is in agreement with the sign adjustment analysis and also in agreement with the summary of staff recommendations, including that conformance with code criteria including the sign adjustment criteria and the reasons they gave for the major adjustments to increase the sign area and letter height not meeting the criteria for approval as proposed. However, the VENA board is opposed to the first of the three staff recommendations to approve the major adjustment to increase sign area which reads, the primary frontage sign square footage shall be restricted to a maximum of 280 square feet, which is a 40% increase from that allowed instead of the 381 square feet (a 75% increase), we believe staff’s first condition does not meet the City’s criteria to increase the sign area and the height as proposed for the following reasons. The increased sign area of approximately 40% is not necessary to compensate for an unusual site shape, orientation, or size of the property; it will exceed the visibility comparable to that available to nearby tenant spaces of approximately the same size and shape within the Gardens on Havana shopping center; and it does not mitigate adverse impacts on abutting lots, which are all the same reasons stated for denial of the original proposal in the staff report. Additionally, the adjustment violates conditions of approval specifically applied to the development of the property. Staff cites Case Number 2007-2008-00 in the staff report which was previously approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council, so this should not be allowed at all. It violates the previous approval criteria from the original approval. In addition, the results of development review for sign adjustment analysis staff mentions that the tenant will have multiple tenant sign placards on the Gardens on Havana shopping center monument signs along the arterial streets which already increase visibility. There is also such a monument sign on E. Mississippi Avenue in close proximity to the Ross store and it is currently showing on a placard that a Ross store is coming soon. And in fact, this is the second development application received for this major adjustment to increase the sign area and letter height for this Ross store. The first was withdrawn when the owner of the center AmCap opposed the application, and we’re wondering why they’re supporting it this time. It is for these reasons that the VENA board requests that you deny both the applicant’s development application and staff’s recommendation. The Gardens on Havana Master Plan calls for brick and earth colors on the building. How did the two blue stripes get approved? And that had been permitted by the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. Through the entire center, the Ross store is the only one in violation of this and it sticks out. It is requested that the blue stripes be removed and replaced with the same color as it was originally. VENA had originally worked with Gary Paschel, the original owner of the property, and if this adjustment is approved it will do away with the agreements that were made when the Master Plan was approved.

Commissioner Jetchick indicated that she was really involved in the original Gardens on Havana development. Directed towards Mr. Shultz’s questions, she indicated that she was under the impression that the VENA board was opposed to any signage at all on the backside of the shopping center. But Petco does have a sign on the back of their space in the center. I’m not sure when that went up, but it was approved, so this Ross signage on the east side would not be setting a precedent. She also asked if the blue lettering is a trademark of Ross.

Mr. Shultz indicated that it wasn’t the blue lettering, but the blue striping shown on the elevations about 4 feet long and 6 or 8 inches tall.

Chairman Lyon asked staff to comment on the questions and issues raised by Mr. Shultz, how they impact the recommendation and what impacts they may have on the other businesses in the center if this is approved.

Mr. Osoba indicated that the violations of previous conditions from the Planning and Zoning Commission or City Council would not be violated because those are any conditions of approval specifically applied by the Planning and Zoning Commission or City Council at the time of hearing of that case. So that specific case number, 2007-2008-00, is the Gardens on Havana Master Plan case number. If there were any specific conditions of approval added by the Planning and Zoning Commission or City Council at the time of approval, then those conditions may not be violated by any forthcoming adjustment. Staff has gone through the case file and found that no conditions of approval previously approved by either of the approving bodies would be violated with this adjustment request. The blue ribbons seen on the elevation photos were included in an already approved tenant improvement permit for that tenant space (permit number 1435421). The sign permit is a separate application and permit, which will not be approved unless this adjustment is approved first by the Planning and Zoning Commission. In regard to how the adjustment will impact other businesses in the center, this adjustment will not set precedence because all
tenants within the center have to either comply with the exact same approval criteria and standards within the Master Plan or they have the option of submitting a request for a major adjustment. Any adjustment request is reviewed based on the criteria for approval as it relates to that specific property. These would also have to be approved by the Gardens on Havana ownership as well and go through the same process for approval through the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Commissioner Hogan asked staff if there is a maximum signage amount for the entire center. She indicated there could be a situation where all other tenants within the center request the adjustment and get an additional signage, so on what basis could the Planning and Zoning Commission say no. But if it’s an owner issues to keep signage compliant, then the owner becomes the enforcer of these standards, instead of the Planning and Zoning Commission being the bad-guys and saying no.

Mr. Osoba indicated that there is not a maximum signage allocation for the whole shopping center, but only for individual tenants based on their size. Each tenant has an absolute maximum of 800 total square feet but must also meet the requirements for individual sign maximums and maximum total sign area, which is based on linear frontage.

Commissioner Hogan followed up to her first question by asking staff if the 40% increase is needed to be visible and marketable.

Mr. Osoba indicated that in this center, staff feels that due to the site conditions, and the fact that the building is set back approximately 500-feet from S. Havana Street, the 40% increase would be necessary for visibility in the center if the staff recommended conditions of approval are applied.

Commissioner Bengen asked staff what is to prevent Dick’s Sporting Goods or Sprouts or ULTA or any of these other businesses asking for an adjustment because they are also back 500-feet from Havana Street. It could become a domino effect all the way down where the Planning and Zoning Commission is approving something that if we didn’t approve in the first place, then we wouldn’t have this domino effect.

Mr. Osoba indicated that all tenants and pad sites within the Gardens on Havana have to follow the master sign plan standards or apply for adjustments from those standards. So, it’s would be the onus of the ownership to enforce, as Commissioner Hogan said, the sign standards within the center. But as long as tenants provide the justification of the criteria for approval and authorization from the ownership group, they can submit those applications for review to be heard at the Planning and Zoning Commission regardless of what is approved or not approved at this hearing.

Commissioner Bengen asked staff under what basis other signs within the center were previously approved.

Mr. Osoba indicated that when the stores opened they would apply for a sign permit to be reviewed under the criteria based on the standards within the Gardens on Havana Master Sign Program. Different tenants have different types of signage. So, if one tenant is a 15,000 – 30,000 square foot space, then it has a specific allocation of signage based on the frontage. If the tenant space is larger, those numbers and calculations change. It is always based on the total linear frontage of the tenant space.

Commissioner Bengen asked staff if this was the first exception to the standards for this center.

Mr. Osoba indicated that yes, this was the first adjustment request in the Gardens on Havana shopping center.

Commissioner Turcios asked staff if this was the largest tenant space in the center.

Mr. Osoba indicated that no, this space is 100 linear feet in length, which allows 200 square feet of signage per the master sign plan. The largest space is the Target store.
Planning Commission Results

Agenda Item 5b – Sign Adjustment

A motion was made by Commissioner Bengen and seconded by Commissioner Jetchick to deny the major adjustment request for the following reasons:
1. The increased sign area is not necessary to compensate for an unusual site shape, orientation, or size of the property;
2. It will exceed the visibility comparable to that available to nearby tenant spaces of approximately the same size and shape within the Gardens on Havana shopping center; and,
3. It does not mitigate adverse impacts on abutting lots.

Further Discussion:
Commissioner Bengen stated that he visited the Gardens on Havana shopping center and he could see Dick’s Sporting Goods and Sprouts from anywhere. It’s up to the color of the signage by the company that is putting up the signage to make sure that it does not disappear in the beige coloring of the façade. He stated that this application is a creeping erosion of standards.

Commissioner Gaiser agreed with the statements made by Commissioner Bengen.

Action Taken: Denied
Votes for the denial motion: 7
Votes against the denial motion: 0
Absent: None
Abstaining: None

Filed: K:\$DA\1608-17sps
SUMMARY OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

Project Name: HIGH POINT - HYDE INDUSTRIAL

Planning Commission Hearing Date: December 09, 2020
City Council Meeting Date: January 25, 2021
Ward: Ward II
Project Type: Zoning Map Amendment
DA Number: DA-2233-00
Case Number(s): 2020-2002-00
Location: QS:94T,94U – South of 64th Avenue between E-470 and Denali Street
Case Manager: Deborah Bickmire

Description:
The applicants, Hyde Development and ACM High Point request to rezone 185.0 acres from Mixed Use-Airport (MU-A) to Airport District (AD). The site is currently vacant and generally located south of 64th Avenue between E-470 Highway and Denali Street. The property is designated Industry Hub “Placetype” in the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan and is included in the High Point at DIA Master Plan.

The Master Plan outlines the subject property’s proposed uses to include Commercial/Retail uses along the 64th Avenue frontage and Industrial uses to the south. The current MU-A zoning promotes a mix of land uses, emphasizing commercial development and high-density residential. The applicants are proposing the AD zoning, which encourages development that maximizes the proximity to regional transportation, to align the zoning with the proposed land uses in the High Point at DIA Master Plan. Due to the visibility of the site from E-470 staff is working with the applicant to include design standards to ensure any buildings visible from E-470 will have high quality design and materials and dock doors or loading areas will not face E-470.

A separate application for the High Point- Hyde Preliminary Plat (Exhibit D) is currently under review and focuses on the infrastructure and phasing for an approximately 133-acre industrial development. The proposed industrial development furthers the vision of the Master Plan to maintain a commercial corridor on 64th Avenue and provide industrial uses in close proximity to Denver International Airport. The rezone to MU-A supports the vision of the Master Plan.

The Zoning Maps below illustrate the context of the subject parcel and the proposed zoning.
Three adjacent property owners were notified of the rezoning application. No comments were received. There are no Homeowner Associations within proximity to this property.

**Testimony Given at the Hearing:**
Stephen Rodriguez, substituting for Case Manager Debbie Bickmire, gave a presentation of the item, including the staff recommendation.

Commissioner Hogan asked staff if there is an E-470 Plan. Mr. Rodriguez answered the he knew of no such plan; however, he stated, that the E-470 Authority receives application referrals on a regular basis.

Commissioner Bengen asked staff if both applicants supported the rezoning of the subject property to AD (Airport District) zoning. Mr. Rodriguez responded that yes, both applicants support the proposed rezoning.

Commissioner Lyon asked the applicant’s representative if the rezoning to AD (Airport District) zoning is more appropriate than MU-A (Mixed Use Airport) zoning. Diana Rael, Norris Design, stated that yes, it is as residential development on the east side of E-470 is not appropriate.

**Planning Commission Results**

Agenda Item 5c – Zoning Map Amendment

A motion was made by Commissioner Bengen and seconded by Commissioner Jetchick.

Move to recommend approval to the City Council the Rezone because the proposal complies with the requirements of Code Section 146-5.4.1.C .3.a for the following reasons:
1. It is consistent with the Aurora Places “Strong Economy” goal to support the growth of primary employment.
2. The proposed rezone is compatible with surrounding development; and,
3. The rezone will not result in the dislocation of tenants or occupants.

**Further Discussion:**
Chairman Lyon commented that this proposal is a good project and wished the applicant the best.

**Action Taken:** Approved

Votes for the Zoning Map Amendment: 7
Votes against the Zoning Map Amendment: 0
Absent: None
Abstaining: None

Filed: K:\SAA\2233-00sps.rtf
SUMMARY OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

Project Name: THE POINT AT NINE MILE MULTI-FAMILY (AFFORDABLE HOUSING)

Planning Commission Hearing Date: December 9, 2020
Deadline for City Council Call Up: January 11, 2021
Ward: Ward IV
Project Type: Site Plan
DA Number: DA-2061-07
Case Number(s): 2020-4019-00
Location: QS:15E – Northeast Corner of S Parker Road and S Quari Street
Case Manager: Heather Lamboy

Description:
The Nine Mile Station Area Plan, which was drafted in 2012, provides a vision to promote mixed-use high-density development close to the Nine Mile station, create a vibrant village-like atmosphere, and promote high quality development that improves the character and land values in the area. Compatibility and scale relative to the adjacent neighborhoods is an important element that informed the adopted Nine Mile Station Area policy recommendations.

In May 2017, The Point at Nine Mile Master Plan was approved after the Aurora Urban Renewal Authority (AURA) completed a Master Development Agreement with the applicant in August of 2016. The approved Master Plan outlines land uses, pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation, and a design vision for the site. As stated in the Plan, “The Point is intended to become a vibrant hub of urbanity, which is defined by eco-friendly design, high-quality architecture, interesting and comfortable active streetscapes where walking and biking are prioritized. The design vision embraces standards for urban development within the suburban area.”

Since the adoption of the Master Plan, Site Plans have been approved for King Soopers as well as the North Retail, which encompasses all development north of E Dartmouth Ave on the site. Attention has shifted to redevelopment of the area south of E Dartmouth Avenue now that the old King Soopers store has been demolished and the new King Soopers is open on the northern portion of the master-planned area. Last year the City applied for and won a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) grant for the construction of a grade-separated pedestrian bridge that will connect the RTD Nine Mile Light Rail Station and parking garage with The Point. The design of the bridge is underway.

The applicant is proposing a Site Plan for a four story 63-unit affordable rental project. The project is utilizing Low Income Housing Tax Credits and will accommodate income levels between 30% and 80% AMI. The applicant, Mile High Development, is a member of the Master Development Team for The Point at Nine Mile Station project. The proposed project will have a compatible design with the rest of the project and will have one-, two-, and three-bedroom units. Market studies in this area show strong demand for an affordable housing project in this area.

Last year an affordable senior housing project was completed north of E Cornell Drive which is adjacent to The Point at Nine Mile Station project. The housing proposed with this application is not age-restricted.

Adjacent to the site there are several condominium communities and large neighborhoods; therefore, 6 abutting property owners and 20 registered homeowner associations received a referral.

No comments were received, and no neighborhood meeting was held.
Testimony Given at the Hearing:
Heather Lamboy, Case Manager, gave a presentation of the item, including the staff recommendation.

George Thorn, Mile High Development, 2000 S Colorado Boulevard, Suite 315, Denver, CO, the applicant, gave a presentation of the item. The market studies that have been done including CHAFA indicates that having affordable housing in this area is needed and will be very successful.

Patrick Hannon, Norris Design, 1101 Bannock Street, Denver, CO, representing the applicant gave a presentation of the item. He noted that the linear shape of the site constrained and made it difficult to meet the Code-required building length, stepbacks, and the Parker Road landscape buffer; as a result, adjustments were requested.

Commissioner Jetchick asked for a recap of the affordability. Mr. Thorn gave an overview and indicated that this will be a Colorado Housing and Finance Authority (CHFA)-funded family and workforce-oriented community. Mr. Thorn pointed out that there are three-bedroom units to provide for larger families.

Commissioner Bengen asked for the rationale for the proposed parking adjustment. Mr. Thorn discussed his experience regarding the request for the required parking adjustment and shared that, especially at TOD sites, there is less demand for parking. Ms. Lamboy noted that a large part of the adjustment is related to guest parking, which can be provided through on-street parking within the rest of The Point or in planned parking garages as well.

Chairman Lyon asked what adjustments are being requested. Ms. Lamboy explained each one and the justifications for them.

There was no further discussion and there was no public comment regarding the proposed affordable housing project.

Planning Commission Results

Agenda Item 5d – Site Plan

A motion was made by Commissioner Jetchick and seconded by Commissioner Turcios

Approval to be subject to the following condition:
1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan and the issuance of building permits.

Further Discussion:
No further discussion occurred.

Action Taken: Approved with Conditions
Votes for the Site Plan: 7
Votes against the Site Plan: 0
Absent: None
Abstaining: None

Condition of approval:
1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation of the Site Plan and the issuance of building permits.