

Summary of Planning and Zoning Commission Votes
 Regular Meeting of the Aurora Colorado Planning Commission
 October 14, 2020

Agenda Item #	Item Description	Plg Dept Recom	Plg Comm Action*	Est. City Council Schedule**
5a.	AT&T CELL TOWER AT SKY RANCH – SITE PLAN AMENDMENT W/ HEIGHT ADJUSTMENT (Ward II) CASE MANAGER: Dan Osoba APPLICANT: Crown Castle Development Application: DA-2246-00 Case Number: 1996-6099-05 General Location: Southeast Corner of S Parker Road and E Yale Avenue (11000 E Yale Avenue) Condition: 1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to issuance of any bulding permits.	Approve w/a condition	Approved w/a condition For Approval: 7 For Denial: 0 Abstentions: 0 Absent: 0	Call-up deadline Nov 2, 2020
5b.	ENT CREDIT UNION – CONDITIONAL USE (Ward VI) CASE MANAGER: Heather Lamboy APPLICANT: Keys+Lauer Architects Development Application: DA-2184-06 Case Number: 2020-6024-01 General Location: Southwest Corner of E Smoky Hill and S Yellowstone Court	Approve	Approved For Approval: 7 For Denial: 0 Abstentions: 0 Absent: 0	Call-up deadline Nov 2, 2020
5c.	ENT CREDIT UNION – SITE PLAN (Ward VI) CASE MANAGER: Heather Lamboy APPLICANT: Keys+Lauer Architects Development Application: DA-2184-06 Case Number: 2020-6024-00 General Location: Southwest Corner of E Smoky Hill and S Yellowstone Court Condition: 1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation and issuance of any building permits.	Approve w/a condition	Approved w/a condition For Approval: 7 For Denial: 0 Abstentions: 0 Absent: 0	Call-up deadline Nov 2, 2020

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.

Planning Department
City of Aurora, Colorado

SUMMARY OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

Project Name: AT&T CELL TOWER AT SKY RANCH

Planning Commission Hearing Date: October 14, 2020
Deadline for City Council Call Up: November 2, 2020
Ward and Council Member: Ward II

Project Type: Site Plan Amendment with Height Adjustment
DA Number: DA-2246-00
Case Number(s): 1996-6099-05
Location: QS:02Q – East of Himalaya Road on Sky Ranch Road North of 26th Avenue
Case Manager: Dan Osoba

Description:

The applicant, Crown Castle, is requesting approval of a Site Plan Amendment to increase the existing telecom facility height from 150' to 173'-9" and co-locate new telecom equipment on the existing monopole. A co-located telecom facility is any cell facility that is designed to accommodate two or more cell antenna arrays and associated equipment. The Unified Development Ordinance encourages co-located where possible to reduce the overall number of towers in the City. The request includes a major adjustment to increase the height to 173'-9" to accommodate this co-located cell facility. The property is surrounded by the Sky Ranch property at 20150 Sky Ranch Road which is near the intersection of 32nd Parkway and Himalaya Road and is within an existing fenced area. The zoning on this property and the surrounding properties is I-1 Business/Tech District. An additional expansion of the fenced area is proposed for new ground mounted equipment and a back-up generator.

The proposed co-located cell antenna is 20' above the existing antennae on the monopole to provide separation between the two equipment clusters. Six (6) new antenna are proposed with this facility expansion along with additional radio heads, and fiber and power lines. A 3'-9" beacon is shown on the top of the pole which brings the maximum height of the facility to 173'-9".

One (1) adjacent property owner and six (6) neighborhood associations were notified of the application. No comments were received, and a neighborhood meeting was not held.

Testimony Given at the Hearing:

Dan Osoba, Case Manager, gave a presentation of the item, including the staff recommendation.

Commissioner Gaiser asked if T-Mobile is the carrier. Mr. Osoba stated that T-Mobile was the proposed carrier for the co-location.

Planning Commission Results

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

Move to approve, with one condition, the Site Plan Amendment for a 173'9" monopole facility and compound expansion, because it complies with the Criteria for Approval for the following reasons:

1. The proposal complies with the standards of the UDO and Criteria for Approval for Telecom Facilities in Section 146-3.3.5.JJ.
2. The co-located facility utilizes existing infrastructure.
3. The proposed co-location and height increase to 173'9" is compatible with the surrounding industrial land uses.

Approval to be subject to the following condition:

1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to issuance of any building permits.

Further Discussion:

No further discussion occurred.

Action Taken: Approved with One a Condition

Votes for the Site Plan: 7

Votes against the Site Plan: 0

Absent: None

Abstaining: None

Filed: K:\\$DA\2246-00sps.rtf

Planning Department
City of Aurora, Colorado

SUMMARY OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTIONS

Project Name: ENT CREDIT UNION AT SMOKY HILL CROSSING

Planning Commission Hearing Date: October 14, 2020
Deadline for City Council Call Up: November 2, 2020
Ward and Council Member: Ward VI

Project Type: Conditional Use and Site Plan
DA Number: DA-2184-06
Case Number(s): 2020-6024-00; 2020-6024-01
Location: QS:24U- Southwest Corner of E Smoky Hill Road and S Yellowstone Court
Case Manager: Heather Lamboy

Description:

The applicant, Keys + Lauer Architects, proposes the Ent Credit Union at Smoky Hill Crossing Conditional Use and Site Plan. The site is a 1.004-acre parcel, zoned Mixed Use - Corridor and controlled by the Smoking Hill Crossings Master Plan, on the south side of Smoky Hill Road near the intersection with E-470. The site will be accessed via South Yellowstone Court.

The single-story credit union building will be 5,400 square feet and will have drive-through service available. Parking is located to the side and rear of the building, with only the exit lane of the drive-through located adjacent to Smoky Hill Road. The site is approximately 10 feet lower than the grade of Smoky Hill Road. Landscape buffering will be utilized to soften the appearance of the building from Smoky Hill, and pedestrians can circulate to other buildings in the development and a sidewalk connection will be provided to Smoky Hill Road. The contemporary building design will include a stacked stone veneer base, rough-base veneer stone to break of the appearance of mass and provide for visual interest, and a standing seam metal roof, all in earth tones.

Components of the Master Plan include standards and guidance which preserve and utilize the views from the site with common space and outdoor patio space for each site. The Master Plan establishes an internal street network, along with architecture and landscape design standards and also provides for a transition from the commercial area to the existing residential area improving compatibility. No waivers or adjustments have been requested with this proposal.

No community comments were received with this application; therefore, a neighborhood meeting was not held.

Testimony Given at the Hearing:

Heather Lamboy, Case Manager, gave a presentation of the item, including the staff recommendations.

Commissioner Jetchick asked if the drive-up will be a 24-hour ATM and if there will be another ATM that customers could walk up to.

Vic Lauer, Keys + Lauer Architects, 417 S Cascade, Colorado Springs, CO, representing the applicant, answered that there will be two ATMS under the canopy and they will be open 24/7. There will also be a walk-up ATM located in the vestibule of the building.

Commissioner Gaiser asked who owns surrounding properties. Ms. Lamboy explained the ownerships.

Commissioner Hogan stated that there was an indication that there will be a berm and the site will sit lower. She asked if that will create issues for visibility of signage. Ms. Lamboy gave an explanation of the location of signs for facility.

There were no members of the public that spoke.

Planning Commission Results

Agenda Item 5b – Conditional Use

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

Move to approve the Conditional Use because the proposal complies with the requirements of Code Section 146-5.4.6.A.3 of the Unified Development Ordinance, for the following reasons:

1. The application complies with applicable standards in the UDO and the Smoky Hill Crossing Master Plan.
2. The application is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan “Strong Economy” principle in that the proposed business will provide job opportunities and services to the community.
3. The size, scale, height, density, multi-modal traffic impact and hours of operation are compatible with existing uses in the area and will not change the predominant character of the area.
4. There is adequate capacity with City infrastructure to serve the proposed development.
5. Adverse impacts to the surrounding area have been mitigated.

Further Discussion:

No further discussion occurred.

Action Taken: Approved

Votes for the Conditional Use: 7

Votes against the Conditional Use: 0

Absent: None

Abstaining: None

Agenda Item 5c – Site Plan

A motion was made by Commissioner Hogan and seconded by Commissioner Geiser.

Move to approve, with one condition, the Site Plan because the proposal complies with the requirements of Code Section 146-5.4.3.B.2.c.i of the Unified Development Services for the following reasons:

1. The proposal complies with the standards of the UDO and other adopted family regulations.
2. Adequate infrastructure has been provided and impacts are mitigated.
3. The proposed building is compatible with the surrounding development and meets all Master Plan standards.

Approval is subject to the following condition:

1. Resolution of outstanding technical issues prior to recordation and issuance of any building permits.

Further Discussion:

No further discussion occurred.

Action Taken: Approved with a Condition

Votes for the Site Plan: 7

Votes against the Site Plan: 0

Absent: None

Abstaining: None