MINUTES OF THE
Lone Tree Planning Commission Meeting
October 27, 2015

Lone Tree Civic Center

1. **Attendance**

In attendance were:

Martha Sippel, Chair
Dave Kirchner, Vice-Chair
Rhonda Carlson, Planning Commissioner
Andrew Dodgen, Planning Commissioner
Stephen Mikolajczak, Planning Commissioner
Herb Steele, Planning Commissioner

In attendance from staff were:

Kelly First, Community Development Director
John Cotten, Public Works Director
Jennifer Drybread, Senior Planner
Hans Friedel, Planner II

2. **Opening of Meeting / Roll Call**

Chair Sippel called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. She stated that the meeting audio would be recorded.

3. **Conflict of Interest Inquiry**

There were none stated.

4. **Public Comment (For Items NOT appearing on the agenda)**

There was no public comment for items not on the agenda.

5. **Minutes of the October 13, 2015 Planning Commission meeting**

Commissioner Carlson moved to approve the minutes, Commissioner Dodgen seconded, and the minutes of the October 13, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting were approved unanimously.

6. **RidgeGate Section 22, Filing 1(also known as Tract GG or The Retreat at RidgeGate) Project SB15-57R. This project was heard on October 13, 2015 and continued by the Planning Commission to this date to provide the applicant more time to provide additional information. This project is generally located in RidgeGate, at the southern end of Cabela Drive.**

Ms. Drybread introduced the item, a request for recommendation of approval of a preliminary plan for 70 single-family residential lots and 21 tracts on 47.7 acres in RidgeGate and approval of a subarea plan amendment. The agenda item was a continuation from the 10/13/15 meeting. The Commissioners requested additional information from the applicant consisting of a building massing study as viewed from the trail, a plan to stake the future extension of Cabela Drive, and per concerns from the Montecito community residents in attendance, additional study on the location of the pump station and the Alicante Road connection between Montecito and Tract GG.

Ms. Drybread exhibited new photo simulations from the applicant depicting the proposed development. She showed a map depicting where the future extension of Cabela Drive would be and how it would be staked. The proposed lots adjacent to the future road location would be noticed regarding the future development potential of the bluffs (261 + 85 units at maximum build out). She presented three alternatives locations for the pump station required to serve Tract GG – including one that was across Cabela Drive within the commercial area of RidgeGate Commons.

Staff supported a full unrestricted, vehicular connection between Tract GG and Montecito via Alicante Road as it would provide residents more choice and efficiency in trip routes, provide more efficient service delivery, and was supported by the Lone Tree Comprehensive Plan, RidgeGate PDD zoning, and RidgeGate Roadway Standards. It was estimated that only 40 trips per day would come through Montecito from Tract GG. Should the Planning Commission choose the emergency access-only option, street maintenance would need to be worked out prior to final plat approval.

Staff found that the preliminary plan and subarea plan amendments were in conformance with the City Comprehensive Plan, Zoning and Subdivision Regulations, and the RidgeGate PDD and subarea plan. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the preliminary plan and subarea plan subject to the following conditions:

- Incorporating wildfire mitigation measures in the CC&Rs
- Posting a map in the sales office and providing a map to purchasers about future development on the bluff tops along with signage posted on the future road alignment
- Distributing information to residents about living with wildlife
- Final approval by the City Public Works Department

She introduced the applicant, Ms. Lisa Evans, with Century Communities.

Ms. Evans thanked the Commission for the opportunity return in two weeks. Her development team, entitlement and development colleagues, and Liesel Cooper, Century's Colorado President joined her. She thanked the Montecito residents, staff, and Southgate Water and Sanitation District for their work on this project.

First, she discussed the relocation of the pump station. Three alternatives were presented. The third option was presented in greatest detail, and is located across from Cabela Drive in a C-M/U planning area, which is commercial zoning and just inside Southgate's district boundary. Landscaping would continue along the entryway drive into the subdivision. It was important that all the landscaping would be within the district boundary. This new location was what the Montecito homeowners desired.

She also pointed out that through working with the Montecito homeowners; the orientation of lots 25 and 26 was shifted to reduce the visual impacts of these lots.

She transitioned to the issue of access. She thanked Public Works, City Planning, and South Metro Fire and Rescue Authority, adding that Marshall Anthony Valdez was in attendance. Ms. Evans stated that though the Alicante Road access as presented would be closed to cars, it would be open to bicyclists and pedestrians. There would be bollards spaced so as to visually discourage through-traffic. Century was requesting that it be an emergency-only connection due to this being the desire of the Montecito homeowners.

She pointed to a map depicting the location of the future road and relocation of the trail, and how several locations on the cul-de-sac and at the end of the road and further down would be marked with signage to be maintained by the metro district. These signs would clearly state "future road," and these signs would be in place prior to any home sales.

She addressed the previous Commission discussion on the issue of overall density. The Belvedere neighborhood was 12 dwelling units per acre, Montecito was 3.4, and the Retreat at RidgeGate (Tract GG) would be 1.4. Typical single-family detached subdivisions are 4-6 dwelling units per acre. Future home sites south and west were designed to be 1-acre lots – so this indicated a natural progression. She exhibited renderings showing the density and massing of homes as viewed from the trail, including a person rendered for scale and perspective. Due to topography, one could not see all of the homes at once. She showed the community from the southern end. Though the lot locations were accurate, the architecture was subject to change – orientation and lot location were accurate on the rendering. She also presented some low-angle aerial perspectives of the future development showing massing, orientation, and scale. She highlighted the width of the drainage channel, how the houses fingered-out in the development, and views between and over houses of the bluffs. They believed that the design was very special as it was developed in and around the channel. She hoped that the revisions addressed key questions from two weeks ago.

The Alicante access would be wide enough to allow emergency vehicles to pass; but visually discourage cars. It would not look receptive to through traffic and would be signed accordingly. She presented a plan view of the intersection. There would be a "no outlet" sign posted on Alicante Road. There would be two types of pavement, 10 foot-wide in the center, and decorative, stamped pavement on the edges, to provide the necessary width for snow plowing and emergency vehicles but provide visual cues that this is not a through lane. The junction would be like a sidewalk ramp at the emergency access, and it would be posted "emergency access only."

Chair Sippel invited Mr. David Irish, the District Manager with Southgate Water and Sanitation Districts to answer questions from the Commission. Commissioner Kirchner inquired whether the location of the pump station mattered to them. Mr. Irish responded that as long as the pump station location physically worked, their staff had no issue with any of the alternatives presented.

Commissioner Carlson inquired about the proposed new location of the pump station relative to the first two locations near Alicante Road at Montecito, since the applicant indicated at the prior meeting that the pump station needed to be near the water main, at

a higher elevation (at the border between the neighborhoods in Tract A). Ms. Evans responded that the elevation of all three pump station locations was appropriate. She inquired about locating the pump station on the border between the neighborhoods in Tract U. Ms. Lisa Albers, with Century Communities, fielded the question, responding that this location was a deep gully with steep slopes. Locating it there would be very difficult due to the topography. It would also be right behind two Montecito lots. Commissioner Carlson also inquired about keeping it near the two existing water lines. Ms. Albers discussed the importance of keeping it near three-phase power lines, and the water mains. They have agreed to extend the water line to the other side of the street to locate the pump station across from Cabela Drive. She asked if it was possible to locate the water line on the west side of Cabela Drive (on the Montecito side of the street). Ms. Albers pointed out that this land was already purchased by the hotel. They discussed another location that was in a 100-year detention area – and they were not allowed to locate it there.

Commissioner Dodgen asked who would control the ability to put more plants on the other edge of the boundary. The alternative pump location across from Cabela Drive only showed two trees on the landscape plan. Mr. Irish responded that this boundary was not only Southgate's, but also coterminous with the limits of the Denver Water Combined Service Area boundary, and their agreements with Denver precluded them from providing service on the other side of the boundary. They could not maintain trees on the other side of the boundary – any irrigation would have to come from another source.

Commissioner Steele stated that they were given rudimentary architectural renderings of the pump station, and that option two included more landscaping. He was more favorable of locating the pump station in a commercial district, but also acknowledged that the new location placed it at the entry point to future upscale communities on the bluffs. It was nice that the architecture looked like a guard house. He was concerned that there would only be two trees planted for screening. He asked Mr. Irish to walk through the use of this pump station. Mr. Irish stated that Southgate would be very flexible with the pump station architecture and landscaping as Century would build it, so long as it met their and Denver's standards for a pumping station, which they were also contractually obligated to meet.

Commissioner Steele inquired about the number of vehicles that could be seen through the fencing. The fence was intended for security and not screening. Mr. Irish responded that they had no plans to have an ongoing vehicle presence there as it is far from their district headquarters in Greenwood Village. They would prefer the building be large enough to house a vehicle overnight. This was for weather protection and security if they were working on an ongoing project.

Commissioner Steele stated that he lived near a Southgate facility on Yosemite Street, and that there was outdoor storage of materials there. Mr. Irish responded that they use a maintenance contractor for all of their major work, and they did not have large equipment other than one small dump truck which they kept at their Orchard Road site emphasizing that this pump station was at the very southern boundary of their district.

Commissioner Steele inquired about what would be at the second option for location for the pump station if it was moved to across the street. Ms. Evans said they would add

natural vegetation and landscaping along the entry drive – providing more of a visual buffer between Montecito and Tract GG.

Ms. Albers stated that Commissioner Steele had a good comment about the entry. She stated the topography and landscaping would provide a visual buffer to the new pump house location from Montecito residents. The only other option they could possible look at for additional trees would be if Parker Water and Sanitation would let them drill a small well to water new landscaping outside of the boundary.

Commissioner Kirchner asked about them moving and storing dirt at the location of the first pump station.

Ms. Evans responded that this was the location of temporary dirt storage from ongoing construction at Montecito – it was Ms. Evans' preference that this be removed prior to City Council and erosion control blankets put down to re-stabilize the area.

Chair Sippel said she had been at the site, and was baffled as to why the pump station would be relocated to the east along Cabela Drive, where it would be now visible from 20 Montecito homes and southern rooms at the future hotel, when originally, it was only visible from 3-5 homes. She wanted to know how it would be tucked into the topography so that those homes, trail users, and the southern hotel rooms would not see the pump station.

Ms. Albers replied that all three options were acceptable to Century and Southgate but that she wanted to leave the final location up to the homeowners at Montecito. Chair Sippel added that the location of the pump station was not just about Montecito residents, but about everyone in Lone Tree – trail users, passersby, and hotel guests. Ms. Albers presented a contour map showing that the rooftop of the pump station would barely project above the hillside, and it was tucked into the topography. She stated that Chair Sippel was correct, the hotel guests on the southern top floor would see it; however, she also recognized that this was a balancing act. Their original plan was to push the pump station into the hill, but per planning staff comments, the station was moved back from the hill to visually screen any vehicles parked there.

Commissioner Kirchner mentioned that the row of homes along Montecito Drive, along the retaining wall and due to their raised elevation above the draw, would have a clear view of the pump station from their back yards, decks, and windows. In addition to this, the new location would be more visible to the road, trail users, and the hotel.

Ms. Albers replied that mostly the roof would be visible, and that eyes would be mostly drawn to the four-story hotel. In terms of location, just the pump station itself and any water irrigation would have to be within Southgate's district boundary – the parking could be outside Southgate's District. . Plants could not be irrigated with water provided by Southgate District outside of their boundaries.

Commissioner Dodgen inquired whether it was possible to drill a well there. Ms. Albers responded that this was a question for Parker Water; however, they typically did not allow wells to be drilled. Commissioner Dodgen also expressed concern that the pump station would be clearly in the view of the future Tract GG houses and hotel. Ms. Albers was not concerned with the Tract GG view of the pump station, as they have a view of

four-story hotel and a restaurant as well. Ms. Albers said anything could be planted, it just could not be irrigated outside of the district boundary.

Mr. Darryl Jones, of Coventry Development, interjected that he thought the discussion about a potential well was headed in the wrong direction. Water rights would have to be dedicated to Parker Water, and there was no legal agreement to dedicate those water rights. Parker Water would then have to approve this, and it would have to go through their service plan – this was not feasible.

Chair Sippel reiterated her concern that this area was more visible than the previous alternatives for the pump station location.

Commissioner Steele, taking the opposite perspective, that moving the pump station into a commercial area was better, and that the industrial-quality activities around the pump station would be more appropriate in a commercial area. If it was built attractively, it would be better in a commercial location.

Commissioner Kirchner sought clarification about staking the future Cabela Road extension to notify future residents. He felt that the stakes should be appropriately placed so that homeowners would have an idea of the impact of the road's construction on their views. Commissioner Kirchner, agreeing with Chair Sippel, though deferring to comments from homeowners, stated that the location of the pump station at the original location was better for the wider community, as opposed to impacting a few home owners. Recognizing that many Colorado residents like to spend time on their decks, they would have a clear view of the pump station at the new location. He understood residents' concern for traffic through Montecito, and felt that having dual access would be better for both communities. He believed that having dual access into subdivisions was a good idea.

On the visual simulations, Commissioner Kirchner stated that though he appreciated what they did, it was not exactly what he had asked for. There was discussion about the relative heights of homes, as the low-angle aerial taken from a drone distorted some of the houses – they looked flattened in the renderings. Ms. Albers stated that this was a SketchUp 3D rendering perspective artifact.

Commissioner Kirchner inquired about the setbacks between the houses. Ms. Albers, responded that it was 12 feet. He inquired what the setbacks were at Montecito, and the applicant responded 10 feet wall-to-wall. However, there were cantilever elements such as roof eaves that extended into this – so the separation in places was 8 feet. The Retreat would have greater space between buildings. Commissioner Kirchner stated that because the houses were not aligned, there were continual blockages of views between them. Ms. Evans stated that given the topography, they rarely had a typical lot at the Retreat, on average, 9,000 square feet, compared with Montecito's 6,600 square-feet. Commissioner Kirchner stated his biggest problem was massing and density.

Commissioner Carlson asked a follow up question about the setbacks, asking whether some homes could be only 3 feet from retaining walls. Ms. Albers and Ms. Evans responded that yes, however, the houses were offset. They were oriented asymmetrically, with retaining walls, 3 feet on one side, and 9 on the other side. There were build lines so that the outdoor living area would be on the larger of the two. Ms.

Evans stated that the houses were built into the topography. There was 12 feet between houses, and with staggering, they would feel further apart.

Chair Sippel inquired about which houses would fit on which lots. Ms. Evans replied that all the houses were designed to fit on any lot; however, where they were allowed to sit on that lot depended on the topography of that particular lot.

Commissioner Carlson inquired about the changed location of lots 25 and 26, and how this could potentially impact that row of lots. She stated that it looked like there was open space between these two originally. Ms. Evans responded that the future homes would be closer together, and now the walkouts would not face Montecito – mitigating backyard to backyard views. Six lots would be compressed and a water line easement moved from the side to the back of homes.

Commissioner Carlson further inquired about the maintenance of Alicante Road. Mr. Cotten responded that the revised plan did not change anything, the City would not maintain a nonpublic road. The new Tract GG HOA would maintain their portion if closed to through traffic, and the City would maintain the public portion in Montecito.

Commissioner Dodgen followed up with Mr. Cotten about who would maintain portions of the roads near the proposed connection between the neighborhoods. If the City does not own the portion of the road within Montecito, the road goes back to the Montecito homeowners. Mr. Cotten responded that in that scenario it would be vacated and made into a private road owned and maintained by the Montecito HOA. They could then deed it over to the future Tract GG HOA or have an inter-HOA agreement. Ms. Albers stated that the Montecito homeowners did not want to maintain the stub of Alicante Road prior to the connection between the neighborhoods. Mr. Cotten responded that they spoke with the snow removal contractors, and there was initial concern over whether they could back out on a stub, but that they could. Mr. Cotten stated that they would prefer the continuity of the road. The emergency connection could be deeded over to the City in the future; however, the future Tract GG HOA would have to bring it up to City standards – which it would not be if built as proposed. There was discussion over the connection and which portion would belong to whom. Commissioner Dodgen wanted the Montecito residents present to hear that the connection, even if closed to through traffic now, could eventually be deeded over to the City in the future if the Tract GG HOA brought it up to standards and desired to do this.

Commissioner Dodgen inquired about snow removal. Ms. Albers responded that the City would push the snow to the end of Alicante Road and the HOA would take care of it from there.

Commissioner Dodgen asked if Century could give out a map of future development with the welcome packet to future residents. It sounded like this did not happen with Montecito residents. Ms. Albers stated that Century gave out surrounding area reports to future residents; but nothing was approved when Montecito was built – the area was shown generally on a zoning map.

Commissioner Steele stated that there were four options to notice prospective homeowners about the new road, 1) sales information 2) contract, 3) map displayed in office, and 4) signage at the site. He was concerned that prospective residents might not physically visit the site to see the stakes. Commissioner Steele stated that he did not see

the necessity for stakes if everything was signed, maps were placed on the sales office walls, etc.

Ms. Albers stated that before they can open for sales, the roads would have to receive probationary acceptance by the city. The signs noticing "future road" would be 4' x 6' in size.

Commissioner Steele was conflicted over the Alicante Road connection. He stated that when he read the traffic report, closing this access would be a self-inflicted wound to Montecito residents – as, based on the traffic study, they would be the most likely to use this connection. Montecito would now only have one way to RidgeGate Parkway. He also expressed concerned in terms of reversibility, that the HOA would never have the funds to upgrade the road to City standards and deed it back over if they did not want, or could not, maintain it at the same level and capacity. He stated that the simplest approach would be to maintain this as a regular public road maintained by the City – this would reduce complications.

Chair Sippel expressed that she still had concerns over massing, scale, home sizes, and the number of lots, and whether the simulations provided accurate representations of how the homes would fit into the valley against the bluffs – they appeared squashed vertically. Ms. Albers showed two renderings of what the back of homes would like from the trail – and the interplay of walkouts and retaining walls.

Chair Sippel again expressed concern over the more visible location of the pump station.

Chair Sippel emphasized that she supports full access of the road, and supports the importance of keeping things open and connected, especially considering brush fires in Colorado. She would like to see more lots dedicated to ranch-style homes, as opposed to the ten that were dedicated now. She also recommended that the map in the sales office should be a large, visible map. Ms. Evans responded that 49 percent of Montecito were ranches. They added another 18 ranches in their renderings – but that they could not guarantee this.

Chair Sippel stressed the importance of having a large map clearly showing future development in the sales office.

Chair Sippel opened the meeting to public comment at 8:07.

Kevin Spencer, 10482 Ladera Drive, President of Montecito HOA, asked for more than three minutes to speak as he represented the Montecito residents. He thanked the Commissioners for the opportunity to make a statement and for their diligence in reviewing the plans. He thanked Century for working with the Montecito residents' concerns. He said that the residents of Montecito supported the location of the pump station across from Cabela Drive due to being in a commercial area. He stated that the residents of Montecito were finally recognizing that they moved into a city, considering the future hotel, restaurant, and other commercial development coming to the area. He stated that they were in agreement with what was proposed. They wanted to make sure that the pump station was visually appealing, sufficiently landscaped to minimize the visual impact of the storage of equipment and vehicles, and sound attenuated. He stated that most residents believed that the future Marriot hotel would visually dominate, not the pump station.

He stated that Montecito felt strongly about restricting the Alicante Road connection, and would support the emergency-only access connection. Regarding the maintenance of the road, he stated that Mr. Cotten addressed this, and he stated that they would not ask the city to do any more than they do today – push the snow to the end of the road. They have reached an agreement with Century to have them maintain a portion of the emergency access road. He emphasized that this connection was needed to provide emergency access to the Retreat, not Montecito. He stated that since Century was willing to step up and maintain that, this was a fair compromise.

Mr. Spencer stated that the Montecito residents did not want the road, and prefer to go out the main entrance. There was a petition with over 100 signatures supporting this. The point regarding the delivery vehicles not having access was a nonfactor. He stated that there were some comments regarding the traffic consultants study. He stated that the traffic consultant took a narrow vision – and they could not anticipate the travel patterns of 225 future homes on the bluffs. It was looking at the traffic generated at the future 70 homes at the Retreat, not considering the future homes up on the bluffs. Due to these reasons, he felt there was not a compelling reason to have a public connection at Alicante Road. He stated the traffic study did not address cut-through traffic to access developments at the Cabela's neighborhood. There are four children with disabilities living in Montecito that could be impacted by traffic

Randy Bell, 10644 Ladera Point, expressed concerns over the impact of headlights on Montecito from the cul-de-sac at the end of lots 25 and 26. He appreciated that they turned the lots so they do not orient into with walkout basements facing Montecito. He stated that they do not have any landscaping blocking the lights of the cul-de-sac. He said the other streets have a cut where emergency vehicles can turn around. He was concerned over vehicle lights shining into their homes. He would like to see lots 25 and 26 located somewhere else within the development, the cul-de-sac eliminated, and have more open space.

Ms. Evans responded that she appreciated that comment. She stated that there would be enhanced landscaping at the end of the cul-de-sac, so that there would not be vehicle lights shining into yards.

Dean Ottenbreit, 10665 Montecito Drive, stated that he went from having an awesome lot to one that would be fifty feet away from the entryway to the neighborhood, and other views. He stated that the hotel to the left will dwarf the pump station and that they support the pump station in the commercial area. They are going to have a view of the restaurant, hotel, and pump station. He said his deck view has a direct view of the new pump station location, and he supported the new location as it is in a commercial area. He stated that the Commission should consider more the view from tax paying residents than hotel guests and trail users. He also supported closing Alicante Road to emergency traffic only.

Jared Wright, 10659 Montecito Drive, stated that the view from his back yard looked right at the future pump station across from Cabela Drive – and that he supported this as it was the best thing for Montecito residents. He stated that the Alicante Road connection was definitely an issue. He would encourage them to ensure that the pump station was properly landscaped and designed to attenuate sound. He stated that there would be model homes with significant traffic, and that they make a recommendation to

move the model homes further within the development. He did not want them right behind Montecito homes. Moving the model homes would resolve a lot of issues with Montecito residents – as the proposed location was in peoples' views. He recommended the Commission reduce the density of Tract GG.

Don Elliman, 10664 Alicante Road, stated that his lot was right on the future cut-through, and therefore most impacted if the pump station were in the first location. He supported the pump station being located across Cabela Drive as depicted in option 3 – as they were most affected if it were in location 1 or 2. He was told unequivocally that nothing would go behind his house and that Alicante would not be a through road. He also stated that if you talk to people who live near pump stations, they do make noise. He supported the pump station being located across from Cabela Drive.

Amy Stadler, 10624 Ladera Point, stated that putting the pump station at location 3 gets it out of their neighborhood. She stated that never did the Montecito residents see a pump station drawn on any future plan. She stated that they should not be concerned with residents' views in the Retreat since they have not yet purchased homes. The pump station provides no value to Montecito residents. Also, she stated that the Hills and the Estates do not connect – and that this has established a precedent that this is acceptable in Lone Tree. If those large communities do not connect, then eliminating this connection to through traffic would be comparatively inconsequential.

Chair Sippel pointed out that Heritage Hills and Heritage Estates were gated communities with private roads, and, therefore, different than Montecito and the Retreat at Ridgegate.

Greg Fong, 10660 Montecito Drive, requested that they remove lots 27-30 from the plan. He reiterated that they were told that the land behind their house was to be permanent open space. He wished there would be more discussion on density, and that if these homes were to remain, they be required to be ranch homes with low profiles.

Since the Montecitio residents indicated their petition had approximately 100 signatures, Commissioner Carlson inquired about the total number of residents in Montecito. There was a response from the applicant that there were 142 homes, with 139 sold.

Jared Wright, 10659 Montecito Drive, stated that he drew up the petitions after going door-to-door and informing residents what was happening. He stated that not everybody got a mailing from Century stating that the future Tract GG development would happen. There were three petitions, one for the road connection, one for reducing the density and moving the Tract GG community away to preserve views, and one to relocate the pump station – approximately 100 people signed all three petitions.

Chair Sippel closed the public hearing at 8:37.

Commissioner Steele inquired of Ms. Evans what floorplans would go on lots 27 and 28. Ms. Evans stated that what was showed on the simulation depicted both of those as ranches, but only 27 was deed-restricted to be a ranch. Ms. Evans stated that they depicted 30 ranches – 42% of the community – as ranches [on the simulations]. The models would be on 27 and 28 with the parking on 29. The simulation showed both models as ranches. She provided a breakdown of the different models – two ranch styles and three two-stories – depicted on the simulation. She reiterated that ten would

be restricted to ranches at key entry points on roads. She also explained that they would have to submit designs to the DRC, and that it was unlikely that they would submit one at a time; therefore, the DRC would get a chance to effectively review the streetscape too.

Commissioner Dodgen asked what the height differential between a one story and a two story was. Ms. Evans responded that the height restriction for R-M/U was 55 feet, they will not have any houses close to that. She added that a typical two story at 12-foot average stories was 26-28 feet including roof pitch, and for a third story, 40 feet.

Mr. Paul Brady, project architect, stated that one of the proposed ranch plans featured a clear story, and the other a 12 foot-high great room. He stated that these would be lower profile than the Montecito ranches. The ranches would be between 15-17 feet in height. Mr. Brady stated that some of the ranch plans in Montecito had voluminous foyers and vaulted studies. Commissioner Dodgen expressed concern that some of these ranch plans were not that different in height from two-story homes. Commissioner Kirchner added that to him, a ranch was a one-story house. If it had a second level, it was not a ranch. Mr. Brady responded that the main living level would be on the ground floor on all ranch models.

Commissioner Dodgen inquired whether they would vote on the different options before them separately, or on the plan as a whole. Chair Sippel did not see how this could be separated. Commissioner Steele recommended taking each individual item to a vote. There was discussion on how to vote on the plan.

Commissioner Steele recommended taking each of the key issues up and seeking an up or down vote, citing the fairly straight forward staff recommendation with conditions. He stated they could indicate whether they support or not the maps or staking. The items remaining were what to do with Alicante Road, the pump station, the floorplans and density, and the screening for lights at the Tract B cul-de-sac. Commissioner Kirchner recommended rolling the recommendations into the final vote. There was a procedural discussion.

Chair Sippel inquired if they ever got clarification on the wildfire mitigation measures, particularly the scrub oak to be removed. Ms. Drybread responded that the applicant would undertake the measures, clear a good part of scrub oak on the south end, and then Rampart Range Metro District would take ownership of it and responsibility to maintain the drainage. Chair Sippel asked about the report's mention of scrub oak on the northeast and southwest portion of the site – as there did not appear to be any scrub oak in these areas. Ms. Drybread's opinion was that this was an error in the report.

Commissioner Kirchner mentioned that a further recommendation would be whether to stake the future extension of Cabela Drive past the end of the road.

Commissioner Steele moved to recommend approval of pump station option 3 as long as it was architecturally well-conceived, and reasonably screened. Commissioner Dodgen seconded, and there was further discussion. Commissioner Steele was unsure whether the plans for the pump station would come back to the Planning Commission for architectural approval. He recognized that they had received reassurance from Southgate and Century that this would be attractive and consistent with the architecture

in the area. He did not know how else to define that this was within the control of the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Mikolajczak suggested making a motion to vote for approval of the project as a whole and then wrap these separate items as conditions. Ms. Drybread stated that the pump station and plans likely will come back before the City Council – it was up to the Director's determination. She recommended an overall vote on the project, staff's recommended conditions, and an up or down vote on the three items discussed, as this would give the Council some clear direction.

Commissioner Kirchner stated that he changed his mind on the location of the pump station, and was now more in favor of Option 3 – and Commissioner Carlson agreed and that it would be masked as well as possible. She stated that City Council has been very good about making sure that designs meet their satisfaction. Commissioner Steele stated that he appreciated the one resident who stated that this pump station does not benefit Montecito at all – so why is it in their neighborhood. Commissioner Kirchner clarified that it was not technically in their neighborhood. Commissioner Steele added that it was close.

Commissioner Mikolajczak abstained from voting on the separate issues because he wanted to vote on the project as a whole.

Chair Sippel stated that she was still conflicted on the location of the pump station, and took issue with the lack of landscaping as there was only two trees; however, she would defer to other commissioners. She then re-summarized that the three issues at hand were the location of the pump station, the Alicante Road connection, and the staking of the extension of Cabela Drive.

Commissioner Kirchner stated that his recommendation was to go along with Planning Staff and recommend the full vehicular access of the Alicante Road connection as originally planned.

There was a procedural discussion, and it was determined that the Chair was polling the individual members for the record on these separate items.

Commissioner Steele stated that he endorsed restricting public access on Alicante Road, and that it be available for emergency-only and pedestrian access and be for the Retreat at RidgeGate.

Commissioner Dodgen concurred with Commissioner Steele.

Chair Sippel concurred with Commissioner Kirchner and Planning staff – that the road should be open for full vehicular access.

Commissioner Mikolajczak's poll response was that the road should remain open.

Commissioner Carlson stated that connectivity was a key tenet of the City's Design Guidelines; but that she could see both sides. She abstained from providing a polling response on the road.

With regards to the staking of the extension of Cabela Drive – Commissioner Kirchner stated that he was in favor of staking the road. He wanted it to be clear to future purchasers in the Retreat.

Commissioner Carlson supported staking the road extension.

Commissioner Mikolajczak did not support requiring Century to stake the road. He wanted this decision left up to Coventry and staff.

Chair Sippel supported staking the road.

Commissioner Dodgen inquired whether the stakes would be wooden with flags. Chair Sippel responded that it could be something more permanent such as metal. Chair Sippel confirmed that signage would be in place regardless. Commissioner Dodgen stated that people move stakes and they can be eyesores, so he was not in favor of staking the future road extensions.

Commissioner Steele agreed with Commissioner Dodgen that staking would be unnecessary, that proper signage would be appropriate, and that staking would take away some of the attractiveness of the trail as it stands today.

Mr. Jones, representing Coventry Development and the Rampart Range Metro District, stated that the district agreed to maintain signage, not staking. He said, in their experience, kids have moved stakes, they had to be replaced, etc. He said it was a cost that seemed unnecessary from a district perspective, and this is something that taxpayers pay for. He emphasized that there was a land owner who had to agree to any terms of the pump station location, as they would be making land donations. He was making these points of clarification for the record.

Commissioner Dodgen motioned to recommend approval of RidgeGate Section 22, Filing 1, also known as Tract GG, the Retreat at RidgeGate, Project SB15-57R, and add to that motion that the polling that took place and the discussion regarding that polling be provided to the City Council for the record, and subject to staff conditions:

- The applicant shall provide wildfire mitigation measures as called for in the proposed Subarea Plan chapter on Planning Area 11 in the CC&Rs to be recorded with the Final Plat.
- The applicant shall post a large map in the sales office and provide a map to purchasers and prospective purchasers of lots in Tract GG that shows the extension of Cabela Drive to the bluffs, with a note that states that, "the extension of Cabela Drive will provide access to a maximum 346 residential units permitted by zoning on top of the bluff tops." This shall be the same language, accompanied by a map that shall be displayed on the various signs posted per the plan on the future alignment of Cabela Drive.
- The developer shall provide information to residents about living with wildlife when they buy their homes, available through the Colorado Parks and Wildlife offices.
- Final approval by the Public Works Department.

Commissioner Steele seconded, and Commissioners Steele, Dodgen, and Carlson voted in favor. Chair Sippel and Commissioners Kirchner and Mikolajczak opposed. It was a split vote.

Commissioner Mikolajczak read from a prepared statement and acknowledged the work the applicant put into the project. However, his objection could be summarized by its visual impacts on the bluffs. Although Tract GG lots are 49% larger than Montecito lots, the 2 foot and 12 foot side setbacks are still far too close. He cited the Comprehensive Plan Section 1, Land Use Goal (Policy 1, p. 12), which calls for supporting a diversity of housing types. He felt the proposed development was too similar to Montecito. He cited Comprehensive Plan polices "Achieve a balanced mix and distribution of land uses in Lone Tree, avoiding undesirable duplication or imbalance, and fostering a live, work, and play environment (Comprehensive Plan, Section 1, Policy 9, p. 16)." The preservation and enhancement of the natural environment is paramount to the overall development concept in the City of Lone Tree. Characteristics of the area's physical environment are also determining factors in why people desire to live in this area. Mountain views, open spaces, native wildlife, and an attractive built environment are a few of the desirable characteristics that attract people to the City and its environs (Subarea Plan, Planning Area 11). Identifying and protecting these key resources remain an important focus in the planning and development review process. The visual environment was also important to Lone Tree residents, and the City takes measures to ensure that this will continue long into the future through development standards, design guidelines, and beautification efforts.

He believes that this project needs to be transitional to future homes up on the Mesa. As an example, Bluffmont Heights and North Sky, although they had typical lots and three-story backsides of homes, are further back to protect the views and enjoyment of the Willow Creek Trail up to Lonehenge.

He continued, that with the Tract GG development of homes along Cottonwood Creek drainage, there will not be the total openness Willow Creek enjoys. He said 50 vs 70 homes would at least provide greater viewing opportunity and thus dramatically improve the experience for those using the trail and those living there.

He cited some statistics regarding 50 as opposed to 70 homes.

- 70 homes, having an average 9,862 sf lots (less than 1/4 acre) = 690,340 sf total = 15.8 acres.
- 690,340 sf / 50 lots = 13,806 sf avg per lot (almost 1/3 acre)
- 13806 sf – 9862 sf = 3944 sf extra to each lot on average, provides 40% larger lots, which if applied to side setbacks provides a substantial increase in visual enjoyment.

He believed that ranch style homes on all lots would be best, but if 2 story option was a must, then he believed that requiring ranch style homes on lots 1, 2, 7 through 29, 50, 56-58, 67-70, which is essentially all higher north perimeter lots and end lots, would help provide a better view of the drainage area and the hillside of the bluffs.

Commissioner Kirchner stated that his objection mirrored what Commissioner Mikolajczak said. At the first work session in May he asked for a visual that shows the project itself viewed from the trail, and he did not think that this particular property can

accommodate the massing and density of houses in a way that reduces the environmental and visual impacts as stated in the sub area plan. He did not feel that the proposed density and mass serves the community of Lone Tree and the Montecito community. He stated that if it came back as a small project, suggesting something around 50 units, he would support it. He did not like the small setbacks between the buildings. He did not like the three-story look of the building when viewed from the trail – the walkouts, though creating nice views for homeowners, create three-story massing. He stated that over 50 of the planned units face north/northeast so that what is seen from the road and trail are mostly 2-3 story buildings. If something came back with lower density, it would stand a much better chance of getting a recommendation.

Chair Sippel stated her agreement with everything Commissioners Mikolajczak and Kirchner said. She believed that the massing and number of lots is too high and that they seemed crowded into the area. She did not like the minimum setbacks and felt the buildings were too large. She thanked the Montecito residents for attending and providing input. When she looked at what was originally approved with the plat for Montecito, and what was actually built by Century, they were two totally different things. She could not recommend this to city council or put her name on something that could develop the same way. She felt some of the lots should be removed and converted to open space. The bluffs are a very important visual and recreation amenity for Lone Tree residents, and builders should carefully consider the visual and environmental consequences when developing in those areas. She supported the staff recommendation that the access road remain open – that this was important for fire safety, as she is a homeowner that has only one ingress-egress into her neighborhood. This project has grown, and though it was originally larger, it has taken over the entire valley. She stated that the static simulations were not what they were looking for; but they showed without a doubt the massing and density of the subdivision.

Commissioner Mikolajczak, recognizing that Chair Sippel and he were term limited, thanked the Chair and the other members for their competence and service. Chair Sippel echoed these comments, thanking the other Commissioners, planning staff, and Public Works.

7. Adjournment

There being no further business, Commissioner Kirchner moved to adjourn, and Commissioner Mikolajczak seconded, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:19 p.m.

These minutes have been reviewed and confirmed by

Martha K. Sippel (name), on Dec. 8, 2015 (date)