

**APPENDIX**  
**Referral Responses and Resident Comments Received after June 8<sup>th</sup>**

**OUTSIDE AGENCIES**

**Littleton School Dist.**

Thanks Phil,

Currently we have capacity of 96 students at Wilder that are opened enrolled students from outside the District. We have excess capacity at both Goddard, and Heritage. We take open enrolled students and we also have room for more students.

We ask the enrollment projections because we could not tell from the info provided what the price point of the houses were. We have since got that information and it appears that we have the capacity in all of our levels for this development.

We still remain concerned about the traffic and transportation issue.

Diane Doney

Assistant Superintendent of Business Services/CFO

Littleton Public Schools

5776 South Crocker Street

Littleton, Colorado 80120-2094

(303) 347 - 3379 office

(720) 281 - 1075 cell

[ddoney@lps.k12.co.us](mailto:ddoney@lps.k12.co.us)

On Fri, Jun 10, 2016 at 1:28 PM, Town Planner

<[TownPlanner@columbinevalley.org](mailto:TownPlanner@columbinevalley.org)> wrote:

Dianne: When we received the original response to the referral we were asked:

1. "What are the proposed street widths, will there be a stop light and where will the stop signs be?" We replied that we could not give them specific answers until the final plan was submitted.
2. They also asked if the developer could provide the enrollment projects for the Districts Schools. This was the question that puzzled me. In the past, as Planning Director in Arapahoe County, we sent hundreds of referrals to School Districts. The major purpose of those referrals was to get information on the projected enrollment from the proposed development, and the capacity of the area schools to accommodate that enrollment. It was always the District that provided that information. Neither the developer of the Town has the expertise nor the data base to do that. It is, has always has been, a School District responsibility. This information is critical if we are to assess the impacts of the proposed development.

July 14, 2016

Diane Doney

Assistant Superintendent of Business Services/CFO

Littleton Public Schools

"The key to long-term success is a willingness to disrupt your own comfort for the sake of continued growth" Todd Henry

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Diane Doney <[ddoney@lps.k12.co.us](mailto:ddoney@lps.k12.co.us)>

**Date:** June 28, 2016 at 2:04:05 PM MDT

**To:** Town Planner <[townplanner@columbinevalley.org](mailto:townplanner@columbinevalley.org)>

**Cc:** Terry Davis <[tdavis@lps.k12.co.us](mailto:tdavis@lps.k12.co.us)>

**Subject: Fwd: Message from p-esc-k363-2**

Phil,

I have attached a memo that shows our current schools capacity and we are projecting stable enrollment in these schools. We continue to attract out-of-district enrollment in these schools and I explain in the memo what could happen if we have more in district enrollment. This is the documentation that we gave to the parent group that we met with from the area of the proposed development. It was my understanding that the current development of 105 single FRU had been denied and that a development with lesser density had been approved.

Diane Doney

Assistant Superintendent of Business Services/CFO

Littleton Public Schools

5776 South Crocker Street

Littleton, Colorado 80120-2094

(303) 347 - 3379 office

(720) 281 - 1075 cell

[ddoney@lps.k12.co.us](mailto:ddoney@lps.k12.co.us)

### **Meeting with Wilder Parents**

LPS Point of Contact: Diane Doney, Assistant Superintendent of Business Services/CFO  
[ddoney@lps.k12.co.us](mailto:ddoney@lps.k12.co.us) (303) 347-3379

#### **1) What is the capacity at Wilder, Goddard and Heritage given current facilities?**

Wilder: 603 students (FTE-equivalent)  
Goddard: 826 students (FTE-equivalent)  
Heritage: 1,986 students (FTE-equivalent)

#### **2) What is current enrollment at Wilder, Goddard and Heritage?**

Wilder: 600 students (FTE-equivalent)  
Goddard: 732 students (FTE-equivalent)  
Heritage: 1,654 students (FTE-equivalent)

#### **3) What number of current enrollment is open enrollment?**

Current open enrollment for the district is 3,079.

Wilder: 96 students  
Goddard: 123 students  
Heritage: 417 students

#### **4) Do open-enrollment students already in the district have priority over new in-district students? What is open enrollment policy, especially around younger siblings of open enrollment students? Are they always grandfathered in or do they "reapply" each year?**

Please see Board Policies IIB, JCA, JFBA, JFBA-R, JFBB, and JFBB-R (attached).

#### **5) How would LPS handle the addition of, as an example, 50 new in-district students at each school (Wilder, Goddard, Heritage) over the next 2-3 years? What are the features and safety of any temporary facilities that might be used? What options other than trailers exist?**

LPS has been monitoring the new development within the district's boundaries and has been in contact with the principal of Wilder about the potential influx of new students. Currently, there are out-of-district, open-enrolled students in each grade at Wilder. Depending on the grade level of the new in-district student(s), it is possible that the out-of-district student(s) would have to return to their home district school.

#### **6) What would the class sizes look like in this scenario and is there a "cap"?**

Class size depends on the student demographics, physical size of the classroom, and the educator rather than a set cap.

#### **7). What are some of the funding concerns in light of the possible aforementioned scenario?**

The district is funded for the number of students that we have enrolled and attending school on October 1<sup>st</sup> (statewide student count day).

## CDOT

*In reviewing the traffic study, we note the developer is prepared to do all turn lane improvements on SH 75 at Hunter Run Lane that are required to serve the additional traffic.*

- a. The southbound turn lane will need to be extended. I would like to see the striping extended as far north as possible with back to back turn lanes for Hunters Run Lane and Coal Mine Ave.*
- b. A northbound deceleration lane (right turn lane) will need to be provided for Hunters Run Lane. SH 75 can be widened on the west side to provide a shift and room for a 12-foot lane with shoulders. With the background traffic of 18,000 cars a day, the deceleration lane will be needed for safety at this intersection.*
- c. An acceleration lane northbound from Hunters Lane will not improve operations. I have no objection to the developer not providing this lane.*
- d. To obtain permission to construct, modify a vehicular access, where such work will be within state highway right-of-way, a state highway Access Permit is required. Please visit our website at <https://www.codot.gov/business/permits/accesspermits/documents> or obtain the application through this office.*
- e. CDOT requires overhead lights at intersections. Currently a light is not provided at this intersection. I recommend a 250-watt light be placed at Hunters Run Lane with this project. The City of Columbine can provide the character of the pole or it can be attached to the existing poles.*

## HOA's

All official HOA responses were included in the June 14<sup>th</sup> full staff report.

## Residents

**From:** daniel dymerski <[danieldymerski@hotmail.com](mailto:danieldymerski@hotmail.com)>

**Date:** June 16, 2016 at 5:27:35 PM MDT

**To:** JD McCrumb <[jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org](mailto:jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org)>

**Subject:** Dymerski

It was a well attended meeting last night and nicely run by the chairperson. Many good points were brought up by both sides of the issue and I hope that you can pass along this brief addition to resident comments to the P and Z Committee.

As I was listening to comments, the common issues were traffic, security, and the quiet peaceful nature of our communities. Having lived in Old Town for thirty-one years, I fully appreciate these characteristics of our area. It has occurred to me that one of the main reasons that we enjoy this lifestyle is that our developments are in fact "cul-de-sac" street systems. Old Town, Burning Tree, Polo Meadows, the Villas, and now Willowcroft are all cul-de-sac systems. There is very limited traffic passing through, which also results in increased security. With our great weather, we always have people walking, children playing and riding bikes, and all of us enjoying the tranquility of our neighborhoods. No one comes to our neighborhoods unless they live here. Most of Columbine Valley is a quiet, secret enclave in metropolitan Denver.

To retain that quality of life for our new neighbors in Wild Plum and the adjacent neighborhoods, I suggest that Hunters Run Lane be the only access to the new development. Having limited access for golf carts, bikes, and walkers is certainly consistent with all of the neighborhoods, but pass through streets will destroy all of the qualities we treasure.

I feel that less density (70 homes), higher quality of construction than we saw last night, and one access point to the new neighborhood will fit well with our Columbine Valley lifestyle.

Thanks for your time and service.

Dan Dymerski  
13 Fairway Lane

---

Recently we received an sincere apology letter apologizing for the propaganda letter sent out by Wild Plum LLC. Being kind hearted, we accepted the apology.

"We look forward to working together with staff, elected officials and residents to develop a first class project that everyone will be proud of."

(signed) Garrett Baum

and I like the bar or standard that he promises, which he should since to most of us Columbine Valley is "first class."

Both my wife and I are frequent flyers with United so my schema of first class mostly relates to being bumped up to first class from economy plus - maybe a dozen times. I couldn't help relating this to the proposed development of Mr. Baum and the narrow front yards within the development. Nothing to make tract housing look like track housing then a row of narrow lots. This development is in economy plus where they give you 9 inches more front to back but you are still squeezed on the sides. Now the first thing I think of (well maybe free drinks) is when we are fortunate enough to be bumped to first class is the luxury of room - usually 4 people across rather than 6. So please allow Mr. Baum to hand us the hot towels so we can wash away the economy plus class development and be bumped up to first class one.

peace,  
Don Miller

---

Phil (who I know is out of town in DC) and Lee (who I hope is in town!)

I received this from Karyn Thompson-Panos. She is a long-time friend. Her son and our son were on the same baseball team for much of their youth, so I value her as a friend and a smart woman. But before I respond, I wanted to check with the two of you to

ensure I say things the right way since I'm sure in the long run everything we write, say and do about this matter might be scrutinized.

I could always say a simple thanks and leave it at that. Or, I could explain that 1) being on P&Z doesn't exempt one from holding opinions, 2) we'll handle testimony in more detail at the second meeting, 3) I don't know what to say about letting CCC "cut" to the head of the line, except that we had intended to give him a few minutes although it wasn't on the agenda and that seemed like a good time, 4) any other HOA could have done the same thing, and finally, tell her that I will certainly relay her questions to Phil for the next meeting -- and that we eager to hear from CDOT, too.

But I wanted advice from the two of you before I did anything.

Sandy

**From:** Plan-Zone Commission <[plan-zonecommission@columbinevalley.org](mailto:plan-zonecommission@columbinevalley.org)>  
**Subject:** FW: Planning and Zoning hearing  
**Date:** June 18, 2016 at 7:28:19 AM MDT  
**To:** Sandy Graham <[sangraham@mac.com](mailto:sangraham@mac.com)>

**From:** Karyn Thompson-Panos [<mailto:ktpdenver@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 17, 2016 6:40 PM  
**To:** Plan-Zone Commission  
**Subject:** Fwd: Planning and Zoning hearing

Madame Chairman,

(That name has a nice ring to it, Sandy!) I wanted to write you with some observations and suggestions from Tuesday's night's Columbine Valley Public Hearing. I am writing this not as a Board member of any HOA, but as a private citizen of Columbine Valley who is interested in fairness and even handedness in dealing with the challenging issue of the development of Wild Plum Farm.

First, let me compliment you on the way you conducted the meeting. You were very professional, courteous, and businesslike. I very much appreciated your comportment during this hearing. However, there were a few matters that I wanted to raise with you, especially regarding the comportment of some Commission members, as you prepare for your next hearing.

1. It is my understanding that the Planning and Zoning Commission is a neutral, nonpartisan body that represents all Columbine Valley residents. I was surprised, therefore, to find two members of the Commission expressing what appeared to be strong personal opinion

regarding quality of life at the Country Club and opposing Fairway Lane access to the development. When given the opportunity to clarify what the developer had presented, Mr. Miles and who I believe was Mr. Irwin seemed to opine inappropriately. If they wanted to make a personal case against access to the development, perhaps they should have arrived at 5:30 and signed up with the rest of the public to get their 3 minutes at the end of the meeting.

2. I am concerned about the format of the meeting, where there is no opportunity for untruths presented by a speaker to be corrected at the same meeting. For example, Mr. Tuck reported that the developer of Polo Meadows requested that the neighborhood be annexed (in fact, it was Columbine Valley who requested the annexation) and that he was surprised that Wild Plum Farm was expected to pay for the lion's share of Hunter Run Lane (which had been specified in a contract that his family had signed before the road was built, much to his family's benefit). Both of those statements were untrue, yet neither Mr. Sieber nor Mr. Schiller, who based on their tenure and role likely recognized that these statements were untrue, challenged or corrected Mr. Tuck. While these misrepresentations can be addressed at the next hearing in August, Mr. Tuck left a roomful of people with an incorrect impression.

3. It was surprising that the president of Columbine Country Club was allowed to address the Commission, especially in the first time slot allocated to HOA presidents. The Commission is appointed by the Board of Trustees of the town of Columbine Valley, not by the Country Club. The Country Club should have been given 3 minutes to speak at the end of the meeting, once they signed up for a slot at 5:30 p.m.

4. The Old Town's co-opting 39 minutes on the agenda when they were given only a 9-minute HOA time slot seemed unfair and preferential. I recognize that you seemed surprised by this tactic. The time slot expansion so early in the evening was imbalanced and gave Old Town an extended period of time to present their passionate opposition to sharing the traffic burden of the development via Fairway Lane and reinforce the Columbine Country Club president's sentiment.

For the August meeting, I would ask that more details be provided by Town Planner Phil Sieber regarding the exact plans for Hunter Run Lane, if indeed it is destroyed in order to accommodate 4 years of construction traffic (really? who would agree to that?). 20-year-old trees line the sidewalk, walls, fences and median. The width of this lane, even with the median destroyed, does not meet the Town Planner's requirement of a 60 foot road. This topic was glossed over, almost as a fait accompli. In addition, CDOT's opinion is crucial, for both a single entry on Hunter Run Lane onto a dangerously overcrowded Platte Canyon and for access via an additional entry on Fairway Lane. I'd ask that CDOT send a representative to the next meeting.

Again, Sandy, I want to compliment you on your handling of the hearing and know that you will proceed in fairness. I wanted to share the sentiment in the room and ensure that some of these matters are addressed at the next meeting.

Regards,

*Karyn Thompson-Panos*

**From:** daniel dymerski <[danieldymerski@hotmail.com](mailto:danieldymerski@hotmail.com)>

**Date:** June 16, 2016 at 5:27:35 PM MDT

**To:** JD McCrumb <[jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org](mailto:jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org)>

**Subject: Dymerski**

It was a well attended meeting last night and nicely run by the chairperson. Many good points were brought up by both sides of the issue and I hope that you can pass along this brief addition to resident comments to the P and Z Committee.

As I was listening to comments, the common issues were traffic, security, and the quiet peaceful nature of our communities. Having lived in Old Town for thirty-one years, I fully appreciate these characteristics of our area. It has occurred to me that one of the main reasons that we enjoy this lifestyle is that our developments are in fact "cul-de-sac" street systems. Old Town, Burning Tree, Polo Meadows, the Villas, and now Willowcroft are all cul-de-sac systems. There is very limited traffic passing through, which also results in increased security. With our great weather, we always have people walking, children playing and riding bikes, and all of us enjoying the tranquility of our neighborhoods. No one comes to our neighborhoods unless they live here. Most of Columbine Valley is a quiet, secret enclave in metropolitan Denver.

To retain that quality of life for our new neighbors in Wild Plum and the adjacent neighborhoods, I suggest that Hunters Run Lane be the only access to the new development. Having limited access for golf carts, bikes, and walkers is certainly consistent with all of the neighborhoods, but pass through streets will destroy all of the qualities we treasure.

I feel that less density (70 homes), higher quality of construction than we saw last night, and one access point to the new neighborhood will fit well with our Columbine Valley lifestyle.

Thanks for your time and service.

Dan Dymerski  
13 Fairway Lane  
Sent from my iPad

---

**From:** TIM & SANDI VANDEL <[tsvandel@msn.com](mailto:tsvandel@msn.com)>

**Date:** June 13, 2016 at 5:29:47 PM MDT

**To:** "[jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org](mailto:jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org)" <[jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org](mailto:jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org)>

**Cc:** Tamiko Abo <[tamikoabo@comcast.net](mailto:tamikoabo@comcast.net)>

**Subject: PROPOSED WILD PLUM DEVELOPMENT**

Good Afternoon JD,

First, I would like to thank you for your assistance with our remodel project at 14 Fairway Lane. We greatly appreciated your professionalism as well as the inspectors and staff. It was a pleasure working with you.



After much consideration, I would like to inform you of our decision to oppose the current developmental plan for the Tuck Property located directly south and east of Columbine Country Club.

We are opposing the plan for the following reasons:

1. Direct vehicle access to Fairway Lane. We believe that there should be no vehicle access directly on to Fairway lane. We are not opposed to emergency vehicle, golf cart, bike or pedestrian access. According to the Executive Summary, traffic on Fairway Lane would increase by 27% or 440 cars per day. We believe that this may be a low figure and could easily increase. Currently, Burning Tree and Polo Reserve/Polo Meadows have no direct vehicle access to CCC and we see no reason to change this for the Wild Plum Development.
2. Filing 2 would allow 2 story homes. There are very few mountain views in our neighborhood and we would like to protect these.
3. Visitor Parking—on Street. This assumes that on street parking would be allowed overnight. We would oppose this as well.

We also reviewed the Columbine Valley Master Plan. We would encourage all interested parties to review the entire document. Here are a few excerpts that we thought were appropriate.

Pages 11 and 12:

- \* To preserve undeveloped open space, such as the South Platte River floodplain, in order to maintain a low-density community that provides contrast to the higher-density development nearby.
- \* To develop, through future development approvals and acquisitions if necessary, a cart path and pedestrian trail connecting the town's neighborhoods to enhance a sense of community and identification within the town.
- \* To require future development to provide open space and parks. The current plan does call for open space and we are pleased with that part of the proposal.
- \* To require new developments to have a system of streets that will internally connect that development with the existing community to protect the existing level of service on existing streets. We believe the key words here are "internally connect" and "protect the existing level of service."

Page 25:

- \*Maintain low levels of traffic on internal streets.
- \*Improve the existing routes of ingress and egress of the Town onto Platte Canyon Road and West Bowles Avenue. Once again, please note the word "existing".

Thank you for considering our views. We look forward to the meeting on Tuesday evening.

Tim and Sandi Vandel  
14 Fairway Lane  
Littleton, CO 80123  
303-974-0904  
Planning and Zoning Commission Members  
Town of Columbine Valley  
2 Middlefield  
Columbine Valley, CO 80123  
Members,

In "task charging" the Town Engineer, Mr. Sieber, it is recommended that Planning and Zoning Commission have studies conducted for :

Safety Impact Study of Existing Residents Before and after Wild Plum Farm Development Proposal prepared by a Professional Engineer-Traffic Safety.

Noise and Noise Mitigation Study of Existing Residents Before and after Wild Plum Farm Development Proposal prepared by a Professional Engineer-Noise and Noise Mitigation.

Thank You,

Jim Moore

cc: Tamiko Abo Setter

Ogg- August 9

Sorry Tamiko, I know they have changed the flow of traffic somewhat but "105 houses" is at least 35 too many. 11 customs houses going thru old town is plenty with 59 houses to Platte Canyon.

---

I found it interesting that when I enquired about the brick wall with the developer he stated that when we signed the agreement to get the existing brick wall and metal fencing twenty years ago that that covered his obligation.

No matter what was signed twenty years ago they want to change Hunter Run - take out the median to bring it up to existing code -60 ft. wide. All I know is that when we agreed twenty years ago it was for how it looks NOW and it seems that if the developer wants to change this then it should be his obligation for a wall. The present median does help with sound mitigation with twenty years of plant growth.

Does the developer have any obligation for sound mitigation along Hunter Run?

Enquiring minds want to know,

peace,

Don Miller  
47 Spyglass Dr

-----  
I just wanted to provide an update from this past Wednesday's petition committee meeting with legal counsel.

After talking with legal counsel and reviewing all of the various citizens' concerns, we recommend the Town vote "NO" on the proposed development. This is the wrong development proposal for the lifestyle and values of our town. We are not opposed to development of the Wild Plum property. Our collective goal is to ensure the Wild Plum Farm development is done commensurate with the best interest and values of our Town and Neighborhoods.

During Wednesday's meeting, legal counsel reiterated that this is the biggest decision our town will make and Wild Plum Farm is the last, significant pristine piece of property in our Town and ample time should be allowed to thoughtfully consider all aspects. Any development on Wild Plum Farm is an infill project, it should follow the guidelines of our Master Plan and the current development proposal is out of character with the existing neighborhoods.

We addressed the recent traffic study that was published last week by the Town of Columbine. From the traffic study, the estimated traffic that would be coming out of Wild Plum Farm onto Fairway Lane is 40% which equates to 440 trips more per day. This is a 34% increase to our current traffic which is an estimated 1302 trips per day from the 124 houses east of the bridge. So with that being said, just imagine as you come to the intersection of Fairway Lane and Club Lane, there will be 440 more cars on average per day that stop at that stop sign. The traffic study only addresses vehicle traffic and does not account for pedestrians, golf carts & bicyclists, hence another reason we as a community need more time to address the safety issues more traffic will create for our walk able community that does not have sidewalks.

Furthermore, we have concerns about our already over capacity LPS schools. I have attached an email from Adam & Kristin Dalmy to the LPS Superintendent Mr. Brian Ewert that outlines their concerns. Mr. Ewert responded back that LPS is going to take a neutral position which is shocking as we think of the new and proposed

developments that are happening in our neighborhood right now. We tallied up all of the new and proposed developments and if everything went as planned by the developers we would have 245 new homes feeding into Wilder, Goddard & Heritage. (Valley Villas – 50 units off of Platte Canyon & Bowles, Clayton Farms – 24 units off of Watson Lane & Bowles, Willowcroft – 42 units, Wilder Lane – 24 units and Wild Plum Farm – 105 units). We encourage any of you who have school aged children to write to our school board (see email addresses included in the attached email).

We have had some contact with Columbine Country Club, Michael Bratcher the General Manager plans on attending the June 14<sup>th</sup> meeting but does not plan on speaking. Michael and the Board of Directors are going to be meeting next week and most likely will decide what their official response will be at that meeting. If you are a member of Columbine Country Club, we encourage you to email Michael Bratcher ([mbratcher@columbinecountryclub.org](mailto:mbratcher@columbinecountryclub.org)) with your thoughts and concerns as he has said he will share those comments with the Board of Directors at next week's meeting.

We have received a couple more letters to the Town of Columbine from concerned home owners and with their permission we wanted to share those emails with you (see attached).

Legal counsel also recommended we continue to gather additional signatures for our petition. These signatures can be presented to the Town at the 6/14 meeting. If you or any one you know would like to sign, please have them reach out to me.

Lastly, legal counsel reminded us that when you look at an organizational chart of our Town, the home owners are at the top, we have more say to what happens to our town than we realize. So please remember to mark your calendars for the **June 14<sup>th</sup>** meeting, it is crucial we are all there:

**Planning and Zoning Commission meeting**

**When:** Tues, 6/14 beginning at 6:30 pm

**Where:** Arapahoe County Administration Bldg., 5334 S Prince Street (on Prince Street, just east of Santa Fe. Where we get driver's license and car plates/tags)

Upon entering, individuals or signage will guide us to where we are meeting

Thank you for supporting our beautiful community!

Tamiko Abo Setter

19 Wedge Way

303.347.1573

JD, Phil:

As you know certain residents of the Town recently submitted a Petition relating to the proposed development of Wild Plum Farm. Part of that Petition requested that access to the development, both during and after the construction phase, be limited to Hunter Run only.

Attached is a letter objecting to any attempt to limit access to the development to Hunter Run, which has been electronically signed by 153 residents of Columbine Valley. These signatures were obtained in 4 days, and if given more time I am sure we

could obtain more. However, you indicated that you wanted to have the letter by this afternoon.

Ted Snailum is copied on this email, and we are happy to answer any questions you may have.

Bill Brittan  
President, Polo Meadows HOA

**WILLIAM C. BRITTAN**

270 St. Paul St., Suite 200 Denver, CO 80206  
Direct: [303-394-7207](tel:303-394-7207) Fax: [303-322-5800](tel:303-322-5800)  
[bbrittan@ckbrlaw.com](mailto:bbrittan@ckbrlaw.com) [www.ckbrlaw.com](http://www.ckbrlaw.com)

Letter

June 6, 2016  
Town of Columbine  
Planning & Zoning Commission  
Board of Trustees  
RE: Access To and From Proposed Wild Plum Development

Dear Town Officials:

This letter is submitted specifically in response to the Petition offered by certain residents in the town regarding access to and from any proposed development of the Wild Plum Farm property. The Petition requests that ingress/egress access to the development be limited to Hunter Run Lane only, with emergency, pedestrian and golf cart access only from Fairway Lane.

The undersigned residents of Columbine Valley are strongly opposed to restricting vehicle access to only Hunter Run. Restricting access to Hunter Run would force more traffic onto an already congested Platte Canyon Road and limit access to West Bowles Avenue. Furthermore, as noted by the recently completed Phase II traffic study, the intersection of Hunter Run and Platte Canyon has limited visibility, and the increased traffic at the intersection will only exacerbate safety concerns.

Polo Meadows residents can only enter or leave their neighborhood via Hunter Run onto Platte Canyon. Residents of Old Town, on the other hand, have multiple access points throughout the town to Platte Canyon or Bowles Avenue.

In considering the proposed development we strongly encourage the town to keep the entrances as presented by the developer (Hunter Run and Fairway).

1. Steven Baca  
21 Spyglass Drive
2. Shirley Baca  
21 Spyglass Drive
3. Robert Lanterman  
19 Doral Lane
4. Amy Lanterman  
19 Doral Lane

---

Lee, JD and Phil,



Our second concern is the noise and air pollution that will specifically impact our properties that border Hunter Run Lane. We understand it has been proposed Hunter Run Lane be the sole route for construction traffic. This would require Hunter Run Lane to be completely reconfigured and likely widened to take out not only the median with mature landscaping, but also the mature trees that line our properties. With this widening, with construction traffic, and with increased vehicular traffic going forward, the level of noise, vehicular exhaust, and the loss of mature shade trees are all harmful to our properties. It would seem more reasonable to allow construction traffic through both Fairway Lane and Hunter Run Lane. Fairway Lane, in its present configuration, is able to sustain the construction traffic for the current rebuilding of the Columbine Country Club and the new and remodeled homes within Old Town. Thus, it would not be necessary to alter or change the configuration of Fairway Lane for WPF construction traffic.

If Hunter Run Lane is used as an access, we respectfully request the developer add a nine-foot brick wall along both sides of Hunter Run Lane to insulate our properties from the increased noise and air pollution. We further request Hunter Run Lane be returned to its present configuration post- construction with monies set aside by the developer. Finally, once construction is completed, speed mitigants should be added to Hunter Run Lane (either speed bumps or dips) and stop signs at Thoroughbred Run to promote safety and enforce the existing 25 mph speed limit.

Respectfully submitted,

Mike & Rebecca Audiss  
David & Kathy Bair  
Marty & Ellen Balkema  
Greg & Darla Caudle  
Ken Cook & Linda McMahan  
Laura Downie  
Bob & Barb DeLong  
Pat & Veronica Fitzgerald  
Dave & Alexis Gambetta  
Norm & Barb Herman  
Jim & Leigh Miller  
Stan & Katie Mohler  
Jim & Anne O'Leary  
Brian Pendelton & Susan Stein  
Mark & Patty Scriffiny  
Mark & Linda Shimoda  
Eric & Dawn West

## Comments Received on Revised Plans (After August 4<sup>th</sup>.)

### HOA's

August 18, 2016

Town of Columbine Valley, JD McCrumb, Town Administrator  
Town of Columbine Valley, Phil Sieber, Town Planner  
Planning & Zoning Commission, Sandy Graham, Chair  
2 Middlefield Road  
Columbine Valley, CO 80123

Sent via email:

[jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org](mailto:jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org)

[townplanner@columbinevalley.org](mailto:townplanner@columbinevalley.org)

**RE: Joint letter from Columbine Valley HOA, Polo Meadows HOA, Burning Tree HOA, The Village HOA, and Country Club Villas HOA regarding proposed Wild Plum Development**

Dear Members of the Planning and Zoning Commission:

This letter is submitted jointly on behalf of Columbine Valley HOA, Polo Meadows HOA, Burning Tree HOA, The Village HOA, and Country Club Villas HOA to express our mutual concerns regarding the proposed development of Wild Plum Farm. These concerns echo those raised in previous filings with the Commission, but also expand on points previously made by the HOAs.

As demonstrated by the comments made by counsel for Columbine Valley HOA at the initial hearing held by the Commission on June 14, 2016, both the proposed development plan and Revision 5 do not comply with the current Land Use Regulations of Columbine Valley. The developer is requesting that it be allowed to develop Wild Plum Farm with an average lot size that is either 60% or 78%, respectively, of the required average. The average lot size as required under Section 5.D.2 of the Zoning Code and Land Use Manual must be a minimum of one half acre. Therefore, both the original proposed development plan and Revision 5 should be rejected out of hand as not meeting the basic requirements of Columbine Valley's Land Use Regulations.

In addition, it is clear that the developer failed to meet the vision encompassed in the Master Plan for Columbine Valley. The developer's interpretation of the Master Plan, allowing 105 units on 105 acres of Wild Plum Farm, is inconsistent with the statements in the Master Plan that the development of Wild Plum Farm would be low density. Given that there are only approximately 70 acres of developable land within Wild Plum Farm, the maximum number of homes should also be limited to approximately 70.

Furthermore, the proposed development fails to meet the other requirements of the Land Use Regulations that relate to minimum setbacks. For example, the developer's original proposal includes setbacks as little as 14 feet between homes. The minimum distance between homes as required under Section 5.D.3.b of the Zoning Code and Land Use Manual must be a minimum of 30 feet. Therefore, the original proposal should be rejected out of hand as not meeting the basic requirements of Columbine Valley's Land Use Regulations.

The undersigned neighborhoods are also concerned about the experience of the builder, CalAtlantic to build homes consistent with compatibility and character of the adjacent upscale neighborhoods which consist entirely of custom homes. CalAtlantic's 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter 2016 investor press release states an "average

national selling price of \$447,000". Even in its most expensive region, California and Arizona, the press release shows an average selling price of \$659,000. CalAtlantic, admits it is not a custom, nor a semi-custom, home builder. The builder further acknowledges it builds tract homes. Therefore, the builder, CalAtlantic, should be rejected as the builder of this proposed development.

CalAtlantic has attempted to "redirect" the issue regarding the compatibility and character of the homes by claiming that it will build "modified semi-custom" homes. To our knowledge, the industry does not recognize this term. In reality, the proposed development will consist of tract homes, and the developer's reluctance to admit this speaks volumes about its reliability.

The Town's staff has indicated that it cannot take into account the economic viability of the development in its determination to recommend or not recommend the development to the Commission. However, we believe that the development includes unrealistic expectations and a business plan that is not viable. Given the lot sizes, elevations and other aspects of the project as presented, these estimated sales prices are unrealistic. If we are correct, and the homes are overpriced, this will likely lead to an extended build out time and to further requests for modifications to the project. Given some of the recent problems that the Town has had with other developments, the Town should be extremely cautious in allowing this project to proceed with an unrealistic business plan.

Finally, any development of Wild Plum Farm will require years of cooperation between the developer, the builder, the Town's residents and the Town's governing members and staff. Given the size of the project and extended time of the build out, a very high level of trust will be needed. The developer has already demonstrated that he cannot achieve this high level of trust. As the Commission knows, this developer received approval from the Town for the proposed development of Willowcroft. As construction began, the builder began constructing houses vastly inconsistent with that approved in the Willowcroft Development Plan. The Town, not the developer, was left to enforce the approval conditions and renegotiate with the builder.

As the Commission also knows, a day or two before the initial hearing of the developer's plan, certain residents of the Town received a "Frequently Ask (sic) Questions and Information" letter which appeared to be from the Town of Columbine Valley. This appearance was fostered by the letter speaking of the developer in the third person and using the Town Hall return address on the envelope. The clear intent of this "Frequently Ask Questions" letter was to imply that the Town was in favor of the proposed development. The Town should be reluctant to enter into a long term relationship with a developer who would stoop to this level of deception.

Columbine Valley HOA, Polo Meadows HOA, Burning Tree HOA, The Village HOA and Country Club Villas HOA therefore request that the Commission deny the original proposed development, as well as Revisions 4 & 5.

Respectfully,

Jon Piper, Columbine Valley HOA Representative . Bill Brittan Polo Meadows HOA President

Ted Snailum, Burning Tree HOA President. Jim Roller, The Village HOA President.

D. David Jones

Country Club Estates HOA Representative

CC via email to all of the above



## Residents

J.D. McCrumb,

I have a strong opinion that the Town Planning Staff has more regard for "Togetherness" than for "Safety and Noise".

Full exit and entry on the present Primary Access to Tuck Property, Hunter Run, presents little to no safety problems and noise can be easily corrected with noise abatement walls.

There is presently little pedestrian, bike or golf cart traffic on Hunter Run. Compare that with Fairway, Club and Middlefield !!!

1. Has Town Planning Staff conducted a pedestrian, bike and golf cart traffic safety study on Hunter Run ?
2. Has Town Planning Staff conducted an noise study on Hunter Run, Fairway Lane, Club Lane and Middlefield Road ?
3. Has Town Planning Staff conducted a loss in property value study on Hunter Run, Fairway Lane, Club Lane and Middlefield Road ?

More basically, Compare the Town Planning Staff position on protecting the few residences with back doors and walls on Hunter Run, the inconvenience the "New Owners" waiting longer at Platte Canyon and the "Increase Value" to the Developer by connecting to Fairway Lane.

with

The impact on "Present Owners" living on Fairway, Club and Middlefield and the "Present Owners" using Club and Middlefield for access to Club, Swimming and Golf.

Latest Staff Report "Proposed Sidewalks" "Create a sidewalk system along those streets that accommodate the highest levels of traffic. These include Club, Fairway, and Middlefield."

1. Why is Planning Staff proposing to increase traffic on "those streets that accommodate the highest levels of traffic" ?
2. Why is Planning Staff proposing to increase traffic on those streets that accommodate the highest levels of children traffic ?
3. Where would the sidewalks be placed ?
  - a. Narrow the present roadway ?
  - b. Expand into present owners front yards ? Existing right away ? Condemnation for new right away ? Destroy present landscaping ?  
What cost ? Who Pays Taxpayers or Developers ? For sure existing Home Owner !!!

- c. Present delivery of mail ? where would mail boxes be located ? Checked with U.S. Post Office ?
- d. How does pedestrian sidewalks solve the Bike and Golf Cart safety ? Do bike and golf carts drive on the proposed sidewalks ?
- e. How will present gutter drainage be maintained in the sidewalk design ?

I fully agree that the Tuck Family and the Developer should be able to develop the Wild Plum Farm and should be able to obtain the best profits.

However, this should be accomplish with no loss in standard of living or loss of value of property to existing Property Owners in Town of Columbine Valley.

Should there remain an impact to the Present Property Owner; the Developer should work with Present Property Owner and compensate them for any loss of standard of living or loss in value of property.

Thank You,

Jim Moore

-----  
JD and Phil,

Please include this email concerning the latest Wild Plum Farm proposal in the packet for the P & Z members. Thank you.

Dear Columbine Valley P & Z Committee Members,

I have reviewed the latest proposals from CalAtlantic and my thoughts remain the same as they did back in June at the initial P & Z Meeting. I oppose the initial PDP as well as the two new revisions (Revisions 4 & 5). I am not opposed to development of this property but am opposed to THIS proposal. Some of the reasons I oppose the plans are as follows:

Development Plan

**Density**

I have always had a fundamental issue with the argument that 105 homes is the correct number of homes on this property. I understand that there are 105 total acres and the master plan calls for 1 house per acre; however, there are only approximately 70 acres that are developable. This is a very unique property where 1/3 of the acreage is not useable for building. Therefore, the density of this current proposal is actually 1.5 homes per useable acre, which is considered medium density in the Master Plan. This area is supposed to be developed as low density. Because of the uniqueness of this property, the town needs to revisit this issue, agree that the calculation of density should be made based on developable acreage, and declare that a MAXIMUM of 70 houses can be built on Wild Plum Farm (WPF).

**Character of Neighborhood**

The unique character of Columbine Valley is why we moved here. I love the curved streets without sidewalks, the seamless co-existence of the homes, the golf course, and the club, and the quiet nature of our community. The developer and our town planner seem to want to destroy the character of our

neighborhood. The suggestion by our town planner to add sidewalks, alter the existing charming bridge, and to potentially add gates to the neighborhood will adversely affect the quality of our neighborhood. This community has thrived the way it is for over 60 years. Why should the character of our entire neighborhood be altered because of this proposal?

### **Compatibility**

The town needs to "insure that all future residential development is compatible with adjacent existing residential development." This proposal is not compatible. Firstly, you are squeezing too many homes on the buildable part of this property as outlined above. Additionally, this plan puts a large development of tract homes in the middle of Columbine Valley, a community known for its unique, quality homes, and this is NOT compatible with the adjacent existing residential developments.

### Traffic/Safety

The additional traffic that will be generated by the proposed 105 homes is too much for any of our neighborhood streets and for the surrounding streets (Platte Canyon, Bowles, and Mineral) to handle. When you propose to overbuild on a property, one inevitable consequence will be the traffic and safety. Please keep in mind that Old Town is a neighborhood built within a golf course. The Country Club service and maintenance vehicles are ever present. These vehicles, along with many of the golf carts, do not have brake lights, turn signals, or rearview mirrors. Additionally, there are many pedestrians and children walking or riding bikes to and from the pool and clubhouse. This is a very unique setting with very unique circumstances and should be treated as such. No additional traffic from this development should be routed onto our streets or the safety and serene nature of our community will be compromised.

### Developer/Builder

CalAtlantic builds tract homes. I have been to three of their development properties in this area (Stapleton in Denver, Whispering Pines in Aurora, and the Meadows in Castle Rock). I have visited their model homes in these areas. They build tract homes. I urge you, if you have not already done so, to go visit these sights and see the types of homes they specialize in. The town of Columbine Valley deserves a qualified, experienced builder of semi-custom and custom homes to build the homes on the WPF property. Even the Town Planner states in his Executive Summary that "the applicant also submitted photos of residential units built in other areas...However, these are not the homes they propose to build." What are they going to build on this property? It appears that not even CalAtlantic knows yet what they want to build on WPF. There are too many questions remaining for you to approve this proposal. CalAtlantic, a builder that specializes in building tract homes, is the wrong builder for this very special property.

I also believe that the builder has not made any meaningful concessions since the June meeting. (I understand that CalAtlantic has offered to fund a traffic light at Hunter Run Lane and Platte Canyon but, from what I hear, a traffic light may never be warranted.) They have kept the same number of homes - they have not even decreased the number of homes by 1 - but have willingly sacrificed the open space for the community residents in order to increase the average lot size. This does not affect their bottom line but does affect the quality of life for the future WPF residents. CalAtlantic is aiming for maximum profitability at the expense of the Columbine Valley neighborhoods. This is just not right. We all deserve a builder that will truly work towards a neighborhood solution that works for all parties involved. Additionally, I remain very suspicious of the developer who brought this proposal to the table. No one should forget the deceptive nature of the "Frequently Ask (sic) Questions & Information" letter that many of us received in June from the developer. The explanation we received for this "mistake" did not

make sense. The town should be very wary of entering into another long-term relationship with this developer.

This is the biggest decision this community will make. This is the last and largest remaining piece of property in our neighborhood. We all need to make sure the property is developed for the good of all people involved, not just for one family or one builder.

**P & Z members, I urge you all to deny this PDP. This is the wrong development plan, the wrong builder, and the wrong developer for the Wild Plum Farm property. I urge you to deny this PDP and consider alternatives that allow for sensible development that preserves the character of our town.**

Thank you for your consideration,  
Abbie Jahn  
Columbine Valley Resident

---

### **Jones- 91 Fairway Ln**

All. It is my understanding that comments to you by email will be incorporated in the P&Z packet for the upcoming hearing on August 23<sup>rd</sup>.

My name is William Jones. My wife and I own 91 Fairway Lane. Although I am a member of the Burning Tree HOA, I must make clear that I support the efforts of the Old Town HOA completely in regards to this development.

The threshold issue here is traffic and traffic volume. Despite the traffic studies provided, unleashing the volume of traffic from the development northward will create a persistent danger of injury to the members of the neighborhood. This changes the character of the neighborhood in a meaningful way, and such traffic should not be allowed. The only outlet from my house to the outside is Fairway Lane, and I drive it every day. I know from that experience that allowing the development traffic to access Fairway will be a disaster for the neighborhood.

The easy way is to route the development entirely out to Platte Canyon, following the traditional traffic patterns to the property. Obviously, the lots on Fairway can access Fairway, but all other traffic should route through Hunter's Run.

If this is not possible, the pod system in the proposals is without question the way to go. This would allow some traffic but eliminate the potential for cut-throughs and minimize in the impact on Fairway and the neighborhood. Allowing full access with some gate system is simply a cop out. Once the access is there and built, it is only matter of time until the access is opened to allow the full access which will destroy the character of the neighborhood.

It is my understanding that you are now considering substantial changes to Fairway as a result of this development, including bridge work and/or sidewalks or both. The fact that these are being considered just confirms that the development itself is already negatively impacting the neighborhood, and this should confirm that access should be

denied and routed onto Hunter's Run. We should be forced to change Fairway itself to accommodate the new development when there is no need for any development traffic to go onto Fairway in the first place.

I would note that under the applicable Arapahoe County regs, you would not be permitted to allow a new development that routed this level of traffic over a road with Fairway's dimensions. This increased traffic would change Fairway's designation under the County regs into a feeder road. My question is this: if you would not be permitted to allow this traffic pattern and volume for a new development, what justification can there be to impose those burdens on Fairway as it presently exists? Fairway and the existing neighborhood should not be treated worse as an existing neighborhood than you would treat a new development. You should not permit the volume of traffic from the development to be dumped onto Fairway.

I also have concerns about the overall density calculations of the project, but I will defer and incorporate the comments of the Old Town HOA on that issue. Calculating density using un-useable land is a dodge of the applicable regulations and results in density that is clearly out of the line with the character of the neighborhood and the master plan.

In summary, I support the Old Town HOA and oppose the proposal of the developer. All development traffic (with the exception of lots fronting Fairway itself) should be routed over Hunter's Run to Platte Canyon. If any additional traffic is permitted to Fairway, it should be limited in a meaningful and permanent character through the "pod" proposals presented by the developer and for no more than 1/3 of the development.

Billy Jones  
**William "Billy" F. Jones**  
Partner  
303-292-7930

Dear Mr. Sieber and Mr. McCrumb

Please include this letter (email) in the record as part of your report for the Planning and Zoning packet for the upcoming August 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2016 meeting.

I've been following the Wild Plum development as a curious observer. Many of my friends, neighbors, and family members are more passionate about what is going on. With that said, I feel pretty well informed and have read most everything the town, the developer, the builder, the HOA's, and concerned citizen groups have put out. I've also taken the initiative to educate myself at a high level on urban development and the principles of infrastructure and city planning.

Unlike all these people up-in-arms throughout Polo Meadows, Burning Tree, Brookhaven, Columbine Village, and Columbine Country Club, I think what you are doing is spot on. I think your ideas, plans, interpretation of the master plan, and future vision are brilliant. I don't agree with the people who say you're being led around by the nose by the developer. I vehemently disagree with rumors you're on the take.

The way it is now, having the neighborhoods tied together by golf cart and walking paths only is stupid. People are out walking dogs on the streets, families are riding bikes with their kids on the streets, kids from all different streets and neighborhoods are running around and playing in the streets together. Every day I see people on my street from the other neighborhoods. It's like a never ending inter-neighborhood block party. When I came home from work Monday evening there were several bikes, an electric scooter, some garbage bins, one dog, two dads, a fat short man in a cowboy hat pushing a lawnmower, and a bunch of kids kicking a ball on our street. A lot of times in the winter after school I will see kids playing outside in the snow till dark. I even see senior citizens walking in the middle of the streets in the middle of winter with smiles in the middle of their faces. There is

also a large hound dog that visits from Burning Tree, he comes in my doggy door and tries to sleep with my Fifi.

The golf course and the country club are pretty nice but unfortunately people arrive on foot, bicycles, electric scooters, skateboards, and golf carts. They swim, play tennis, golf, eat, drink, and be merry. They then walk, peddle, and ride home. This clogs up our streets so cars can't drive in and out efficiently. What's really annoying is people want to smile, wave, and talk to me when I'm coming and going. Not only that but the police even wave to me. Unfortunately, after living here for nine years, not only do I know everyone on my street, and the next two streets over, but I also know at least twenty families from Burning Tree, five or six from Columbine Village, eight from Brookhaven, two from Polo Meadows, and even a bunch of infidels from the other side of Platte Canyon. Many of those yahoos are driving golf carts filled with kids into our neighborhood. Mr. Bob Archibald, who's lived here 42 years, flags me down when I drive by and makes me drink 3.2% alcohol Natural Light with him. Do you understand what this does to my liver?

I really appreciate that the two of you have a vision and can make this place better. You are on the right track with developments like Willowcroft Manor. This is new urbanism at its best. You guys nailed it! Even though everyone who lives in Columbine Valley (young or old, longtime resident or just moved in, single or married, kids or no kids), except me, hates it. I love the concept. Put the very largest possible pre-fabricated home on the smallest block of land as close as possible to the next one. Then build a tall brick wall around it so everyone on the outside can only see a bunch of giant roofs. It's too bad they don't have real fireplaces so the chimney sweeps could jump from roof to roof singing and dancing like Bert from Mary Poppins.

Though many people question whether you two have any clue as to what you're doing; I don't. They don't understand your knowledge of urban planning. They don't know you know what's best for them. Clearly the people who originally built this community, several of them still around, were misguided. I wanted to say dumb but that rhymes with Plum which rhymes with McCrumb and I don't want to think you're dumb Mr. McCrumb.

I like that you want the Wild Plum development to have two access points for cars. I think you are on the right track to avoid trying to get a traffic light at Hunters Run Ln. This saves you work and the developer money. Who cares when the new residence try to drive out and the one commuter turning left jams things up for five to ten minutes. This will redirect the traffic back through the golf course, past the club house, and down Middlefield. This will force the pedestrians off the streets and back in cars. I like your idea of putting in sidewalks. On top of that I think you should widen Fairway Ln, Club Ln, and Middlefield Rd. Plus, the traffic dips should be removed and the bridge by the clubhouse should be widened or another bridge added. Hopefully you plan to increase the speed limit to 35 or 45 mph. Can we put in a bridge for golf carts going from the clubhouse to hole ten to keep them out of our way? We will also need one over to the pool and tennis courts. Dammit, we are going to need a bridge between holes one and two, twelve and thirteen, fourteen and fifteen and sixteen and seventeen. Wait, we could use the one from the clubhouse to ten for sixteen to seventeen. But let's not do any of this till after the homes are build and all the places have been sold. I don't want the poor developer to back out now.

I'm a capitalist. I think you should keep encouraging the developer to go with prefab homes on really small lots. You need to let the developer squeeze the most out of every square



inch. Some people like custom homes, but again, I'm with you. Who wants homes that are unique, handsome, and stand the test of time? Landscaped yards are a waste. I bet you can get a lot more homes in there than 105. Put some in the floodplain. That area will never flood. You could put them on stilts. Maybe go with a Queenslander style.

If we are going to go with true new urbanism, we need to do it right. We don't want a half baked faux attempt. Let's make this place creepy like Stapleton. Instead of having lovely winding streets with cul-de-sacs, maybe you could recommend a classic grid layout. What about putting in a gas station and liquor store? With a 7 Eleven you get both. I think the cut-through traffic will appreciate the amenities.

You guys need to go bigger. If you're going to fix this place, you need to fix it right. We don't want everyone moving downtown in search of a more authentic urban experience.

Sincerely

Tony Setter

Wedge Way

Email: [ajsetter@comcast.net](mailto:ajsetter@comcast.net)

Phone: (303) 808-4631

---

Mr. McCrumb and Mr. Sieber:

We are writing to express our concerns regarding the latest revisions and plans regarding the Wild Plum development. Adding sidewalks to our neighborhood thoroughfares will disrupt the park like setting of our beautiful neighborhood. When we moved to Wedge Way we chose this neighborhood because of its unique park like environment. Adding to the density and the implementation of sidewalks is in violation of our city's plan. We do not support any exception.

Please incorporate our input into your P&Z meeting packet.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration in this time of transition. We need to make it right. We only get once chance.

Thank you

Scott and Sue Jones

34 Wedge Way

JD and Phil,

Below is our letter to you and the P&Z and Trustees. We would appreciate this being added to the official record regarding Wild Plum Farm development.

Thank you in advance for your time and attention to this matter.

Respectfully

Carla Brown

-----  
August 18, 2016

Dear Phil and JD,

My name is Carla Brown and my husband, Mark, and I moved to Old Town four years ago. What drew us to this area was the quiet park like atmosphere, the lack of cars and large lots. It was a refuge from the city bustle within the city itself. We always knew Tuck Farm would be developed but also felt this pristine piece of land would carry on the beauty, serene nature and character of its surrounding neighbors.

It then defies all logic that you as our "town planner/staff" can even suggest that we change the character of Old Town to meet any needs of a not yet standing project. It should be the other way around. Wild Plum Farm should be a development that enhances our community not deters from it! This is the last large piece of ground in our community. It is a pristine piece of ground and as such the development of this magnitude should be taken seriously and with great thought. Not one of the surrounding developments to this property is a tract home community. Our home values are built on lot size, custom quality homes, the club and the quiet peaceful nature of our communities. Columbine Valley has recently added two tract developments in our town and each have inventory on hand. Sales at best are sluggish and yet in Burning Tree, Polo Meadows and Old town sales are quite robust. CalAtlantic themselves bragged at one meeting how the sales of the 11/12 proposed lots along Fairway lane would sell quickly and they had 5 to 6 people strongly interested. Point made, custom homes and the lots sell.

Additionally, the idea that traffic should cut through Old Town is ludacris! There are only 18 homes that utilize Hunter Run. There are a total of 22 homes that back up to Hunter Run. Depending on how you filter through Old town you will have traffic going by 38 or 45 FRONT YARDS. Burning Tree and Polo Meadows have little to no impact with regards to traffic within their actual neighborhoods. We all will share the burden of the traffic from Wild Plum on the surrounding feeder streets. This again shows why the proposal should only be 70 homes on a minimum ½ acre lots. The reduction in homes would reduce the traffic impact and can easily be handled by the originally designed access point, Hunter Run, for Wild Plum Farm. It is our understanding that eleven of the homes backing up to Hunter Run in Burning Tree were sold 30' feet more property for the intended purpose of Hunter Run being the Main Access point.

As employees of Columbine Valley it is my understanding you should be working for all of the residents of our community. Yet it feels as if you work more for the developer and what they want. Please take time to listen carefully to what the residents want. Wild Plum Farm will be a statement about our community and we all want it to be representative of the character of our town.

Respectfully,

Carla and Mark Brown  
38 Fairway Lane

**Hambrook (2 emails)**

My name is Connie Hambrook. My husband Ernie and I live at 57 Fairway Lane,

right across from the Tuck property. We have lived here almost 23 years. I hold #9 speaking slot, but unfortunately, Ernie and I have a commitment on August 23, 2016 which has been on our calendars for a long time. Therefore, I submit my speech to you in writing.

One Saturday morning as we were having breakfast, I looked out and saw 4 or 5 little boys on bicycles riding in front of our house and the Barker family's home. I turned away for a minute and then looked back and saw one of the boys laying on the street. I watched as he got up and went to lay in our grass holding his arm. As I walked out and asked if he was ok, he got up and went to the bike. He said he was ok, and another little boy said "he broke his chain". The other little boys swarmed around him like little bees on their bicycles. A woman with a baby carriage came up to them also, and she called the boy's mother while his brother rode off to get the bicyclist's mom. The baby carriage mom raised a thumb's up sign, saying she had it in control. A while later, I saw the dad put the bike and another bike in his vehicle with his two sons and drove home.

I looked out over our street as I went back in, and it seemed so peaceful, and I had a good feeling that little boys (and girls) can still ride their bikes on our streets and not worry about any dangers or terrible accidents, except maybe having a broken bicycle chain.

Our neighborhood children are very lucky to experience the kind of childhood that a lot of us may have been lucky to have growing up. And for those parents who did not have that kind of childhood, what a wonderful gift to give their children to be able to live and play in this beautiful and safe haven we call Columbine. Fairway Lane is not a wide street and with additional traffic as proposed, this incident may not have had such a fortunate ending. The expansive growth for this area is NOT RIGHT!!!!!!!  
Thank you.

To: Planning and Zoning  
Meeting August 23, 2016  
Re: Wild Plum Farm Proposed Revisions 5 and 2

Fairway Lane is not appropriate access for safety purposes alone.

The Staff Report admits as much by proposing to widen the Fairway Lane bridge and to consider the creation of a sidewalk system for Club, Fairway, and Middlefield.

The preservation of the unique characteristics of our town is of utmost importance to all residents. It is apparent that this is not the correct way to go, and we urge the rejection of the proposal.

Respectfully submitted by Ernie and Connie Hambrook who have lived at 57 Fairway Lane for almost 23 years.

Phil and JD,

I am disappointed by the most recent Staff Presentation Report for Wild Plum Farm development. Despite all the hard work conducted by the town staff, there has been almost no improvement to the proposed development plan.

First off, congratulations for getting the developer to comply with some significant items in the Land Use Regs. Set-backs and lot sizes are important to maintain the character of our town. So now I must question your judgement when you propose recommendations which would allow the developer to offer average lot sizes smaller than required by the regulations.

Safety and lifestyle are also universal points of interest for the community and for the Country Club. Even the developer understands this concern. Yet your recommendation is to route more traffic through our town, and to address the safety implications by spending tax dollars on sidewalks and calming measures - a solution which will permanently scar our community. Again, I must question whether your recommendations are in the best interest of the community.

I don't envy your position, working on the largest development project remaining within our town. Your opinions carry weight with the P&Z Commission and with the Board of Trustees. That's a lot of responsibility, impacting the lives of hundreds of families throughout our community. The suggestion I would make is to simplify the issues. Require the developer to submit one plan, without multiple options for access, lot size, and open space. With less distraction, the staff and the community can focus on designing a plan that truly serves the best interest of the community.

As it stands now, the current plans (revisions 1-3 or 4 & 5) and the staff's recommendation all fail to support the best interest of the community.

Please include my comments in the record as part of your report for the P&Z meeting on 8/23.

Regards,

Daniel Penza  
36 Wedge Way

---

**From:** K <[kathy.daly@msn.com](mailto:kathy.daly@msn.com)> ( 2 emails)  
**Date:** August 17, 2016 at 11:20:34 PM MDT  
**To:** "[jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org](mailto:jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org)" <[jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org](mailto:jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org)>  
**Subject:** wild plum farm

Mr McCrumb,

A note of concern for what we call Littleton..let's keep it little town... I moved here 15 years ago from Bonnie Brae to escape the traffic and noise and general congestion of the city. I've been happy up until the last 5 yrs with unnecessary development, especially in open space areas. The purpose of Arapahoe County & Littleton has always been to preserve this. Please do not allow the \$\$\$\$ to get in the way of what people moved here for and are existing here currently for. Please DO NOT sell out our community. It truly would be an injustice to us, and be a negative cloud hanging over your head if you allow development that is not supported from the community. The roads, schools, fire & emergency are not equipped to handle this influx. But most importantly, the citizens you represent are against it. PLEASE LISTEN and act accordingly.

With heartfelt appreciation,

Kathryn S Daly

To whomever it concerns,

A brief note to tell you how against this project I am. It is absolutely disgusting that you are turning our wonderful community into a mess of a city. No schools. roads. fire & police could handle this growth and you

know it. Or if you don't, you might want to look at facts and figures. I'd be happy to provide you with all. Please keep Littleton the wonderful suburban, open space, beautiful place it has been. That's why I moved here 15 years ago. There is a sense of community and love of nature and animals that exists here, not to be broken by development. PLEASE listen to our voices.

With Appreciation,  
Kathryn S. Daly  
(no address)

-----  
Hi JD and Phil,

Hope you are both doing well. My name is Patrick Vahey and I live at 7 Niblick Lane in Columbine Valley. I wanted to take this opportunity to share some comments and concerns regarding the proposed Wild Plum Farm development in advance of the Planning and Zoning Continuance hearing on August 23, 2016.

I have several concerns with the proposed development – primarily traffic/safety (ongoing as well as an increased concern during the lengthy construction process) along with overall aesthetics and community impact. Although those of us that live on Niblick are not as directly impacted by the proposed traffic issues, I am primarily concerned about the impact to the families and children on Middlefield Rd/Club Ln and, more importantly, Fairway Ln, Driver Ln and Wedge Way. There are a tremendous amount of young children in the area and that trend is likely to continue. I do not believe Fairway can accommodate any additional traffic without adversely impacting the quality, feel and safety of the neighborhood. Many young children play in the streets – ride bikes, scooters, run to friends' houses, etc. (all of which are critically important for children, particularly in this age of iphones, ipads, etc) – and I'm concerned as is with existing traffic in the area (exacerbated by people texting while driving). The Staff Report 081516 states that the proposed development is estimated to result in 1,100 additional trips per day. Even if only 32% of those trips are accessed through Fairway Ln, that's over 350 additional trips per day. Given the number of current homes in the immediate area, one can't objectively argue that such an increase would not have a meaningful impact on the quality and character of the neighborhood immediately surrounding the Fairway access.

Point being, even with a pod system I think the additional traffic adversely impacts the neighborhood in such a way that it doesn't meet the town plan and Town Vision "To require new developments to have a system of streets that will internally connect that development with the existing community and protect the existing level of service on existing streets.". Given that they are recommending doing away with the pod system and allowing full access, this is all the more problematic. While a timed gate system may limit some of the incremental traffic associated with full access, it inherently doesn't limit all of it. So it is reasonable to assume that well over 32% of the trips will access through Fairway with a timed gate system. Further, while I have not seen the Phase II Traffic study, the additional research and data collection referenced in the Staff Report does not provide meaningful comfort that "cut through traffic" would be alleviated. First, the additional research and data collection study was done in mid-July. Given that the nearby elementary school (Wilder) was not in session at this time – and the associated heavy volume of traffic stemming from parents and buses dropping off/picking up at Wilder – the study is clearly not representative of traffic patterns during the 9+ months of the year that Wilder is in session. Even if the study was accurate, most people who would utilize "cut through traffic" wouldn't have the luxury of knowing historical average drive times for each option and would tend to just want to avoid the perceived traffic on Platte Canyon. In general, most people would prefer to drive through a neighborhood without much traffic instead of stopping/starting in traffic, even if the net driving time is similar.

Hope this makes sense and please let me know if you have any questions. Lastly, thank you both for all that you do for Columbine Valley – it's much appreciated!

Regards,

Patrick Vahey  
303-586-8008 w  
303-506-2616 c

My name is Mel Frommer. My husband Richard and I live at 61 Fairway Lane. We live Directly across from the proposed Wild Plum development. When we were fortunate enough to

look around for a community we wanted to settle into for our semi-golden years, we chose Columbine. We bought our house in 2008 from the original owner, a lovely woman named Jo DeLong. We planned on doing a complete remodel and sought out an architect that would help us design a home that was in keeping with the charm, individuality and character of the homes at Columbine. We believe our home has enhance the community and brought value as well. We always knew the Tuck property would be developed someday. We also believed that whatever was developed would stay in the character and flow of Columbine Valley homes. This proposed development is not in keeping with the vision or character of the community.

If we are so blessed to have grandchildren someday, we hope we will know the are safe to walk, ride bikes or drive the golf cart to the pool, tennis court or clubhouse, without the concerns of added traffic for Wild Plum or cars that will be cutting through on Fairway. We would love for them to have the freedom and safety that our chosen community currently provides.

There is allot of concern about sharing the burden of traffic or keeping the traffic moving and flowing on the main arteries around town, mostly Platte and Bowles. Ti has been explained that this extra traffic will not effect our level of service. However, there is not one other community this development impacts that has been asked to absorb and accept the increase of traffic directly onto their streets, directly into their neighborhood where their children play, families are out walking together, neighbors are having their evening or morning walks or jogging exercise.

It seems beyond reason that the town planner and developer would ask our community to add sidewalks and change the charming landmark bridge. All this to accommodate the developer and builder. It is an insult to the people who designed the Master Plan. Those people who possibly had the foresight to devise a plan to prevent a development such as this.

We ask you to consider the quality of our community, our neighborhood, that once changed will be forever changed.

Respectfully,

Mel and Richard Frommer

-----  
Greetings,

As a homeowner on Club Lane, I am troubled by the attempt to justify over 100 lots in an area that has obvious man-made and natural physical constraints. In reviewing the staff report and the revised proposed plans of the developer, a few concepts and issues seem to require more attention and consideration. My primary concerns are as follows:

1. **Fairway traffic is already at a “tipping point”**. The concept of bifurcating of the development is helpful but the number of proposed lots in Revisions 4 and 5 having access to Fairway would push the volume of traffic on Fairway well over the “tipping point”. Why not just lower the total number of Lots in WPF to 70 with about 12 lots along Fairway? The Staff should analyze/compare the impact of this configuration with the project proposed by the developer. The residential zoning density of 1 lot/acre does not necessarily or legally entitle the developer to 1 lot/acre at this particular site; the physical constraints and other adverse impacts and the safety of residents must be paramount considerations. The WPF property simply cannot support 1 lot/acre and Fairway certainly cannot handle increased traffic volume from more than 12 lots. Given the

projected number of new Club memberships, we will already have more traffic of all types on Fairway and Club than assumed in the traffic studies.

2. **Gates are not a solution.** The Staff's conclusory statement that a "permanently closed system such as proposed in Revision 4 and 5 is unnecessary since the traffic could be managed with a timed gate system" is strange. The Staff states that the City of Littleton installed the gates in Bow Mar to address a cut-through traffic problem. The Staff seems to miss the point that the gates in Bow Mar were made necessary to correct a planning problem – in the present situation **the Staff should seek to avoid the traffic and cut-through problem in the first place.** Why does the Staff not see that it is "unnecessary" to have the connecting streets at this particular and crucial area? (other than emergency vehicles and carts). Safety concerns should always prevail over mere convenience and waiting times for automobiles.
3. **What about the new Clubhouse impact?** The Staff report does not even mention the new clubhouse being built. The new traffic studies were conducted this past July. Next summer the new clubhouse will create a virtual beehive of activity operating a fitness center and multiple dining facilities at all hours. The number of people at the Club at any given time will easily exceed 100-200 people (just my personal estimation) which is 100-200 more than this July. The July traffic study for the critical area around the Club Lane and Fairway intersection is grossly misleading and the number of carts, cars, pedestrians and "conflicts" seems vastly understated. Paragraph C. of the Staff's summary states that the current traffic conflicts do not indicate a "major safety problem" – when the traffic doubles or triples upon opening of the clubhouse, it will be a "major safety problem" and the Town will not have the means or money to deal with it. The traffic consultant's failure to even consider or mention this fact is very troubling.
4. **Emergency connection is sufficient.** As noted above, gates are unnecessary if the development is bifurcated. If the Town is concerned about emergency vehicles; a single concrete drive lane, well-marked for emergency vehicles only, could be used to connect the neighborhoods. Anything more is not necessary and a through street would only provide a convenience and an attractive nuisance for cut-through commuters at the expense of our children's safety. This would seem to be preferable to the future residents of WPF too.
5. **If there are gates, who will decide gate closure timing?** A gate system will create confusion and bickering among the residents in the future. If gates are installed, the town will need to be prepared to address constant resident complaints and divisive politics over gate closure timing. In addition, CDOT, RTD or some other state agency (such as the school district for buses), may override the Town's gate closure timing. The gates may also have the unintended consequence of creating a private gated community for WPF within the Town at the expense of other neighborhoods.
6. **Future developments considered?** The traffic study presented at the hearing did not account for projected dense and intensive uses of land south of Town such as Santa Fe and Mineral – this land looks to be developed as a shopping center and more apartments – more cut-through potential. It seems that having a bifurcated development (with emergency vehicle access only) would act as a traffic "buffer" to help all the affected Columbine Valley neighborhoods avoid cut-through or increased random traffic and crime in the neighborhoods.
7. **What does the extra pavement on the bridge really do for safety?** Widening the pavement on the Fairway bridge as suggested by the staff will not really help – the unpaved portion is minimal. The only real safety solution is to widen the bridge or the developer can pay for a new

separate pedestrian/cart bridge. Extending pavement will just help cars go faster and we would lose the nice plants and flowers on the bridge. These bridge improvements may not be necessary if the number of new lots having access to Fairway is limited to 12.

8. **Who wants urban sidewalks?** The Staff recommends creating sidewalks along Club Middlefield and Fairway – adding sidewalks could lead to street drainage and sewer line issues. This would be expensive and the developer should pay for the new sidewalks as they are not currently necessary. Most residents I know appreciate the fact that our streets do not appear “urbanized” with sidewalks and we would like to keep it that way. If the number of new lots with access to Fairway is limited to 12, we may not need sidewalks.
9. **All costs covered by developer?** A recent article in the Littleton Independent (linked below) describes the issues facing Mark Relph, the interim City Manager of Littleton, due to underestimating the impact of development on traffic. I don’t want our Town to underestimate the total cost of the project. <http://littletonindependent.net/stories/Traffic-upgrades-urged-for-Littleton-Village,232948>
10. **Need more water?** The staff report indicates that small lots would be better in order to cut down on water usage. Instead of making more smaller lots, why not keep the large lots and require different landscaping or require the developer to dedicate more water rights to the Town/Denver Water upon platting. The developer can purchase more water on the open market for dedication. The water issues cannot be used as a pretext for smaller lots – there are other solutions to retain the character of the area.
11. **Non-potable water?** Has the developer or the Town explored the use of non-potable water for outdoor use? Many new communities are now requiring a double water system (potable outside). Seems like a workable water solution in WPF for the large lots.
12. **Pedestrian traffic around the club is already an poor.** The traffic consultant’s report presented at the prior hearing included a sample photo of what an unacceptable pedestrian scene would look like. This photo was very close to what we currently see on the bridge. Again, consider the full impact of the new clubhouse upon opening next summer.
13. **No material traffic “conflicts”?** The Staff report states that over the past 3 years there have been no crashes involving vehicles or pedestrians. This is incorrect – there was a serious pedestrian hit and run a couple weeks ago on Club Lane near the tennis courts. There was also an accident involving a golf cart and maintenance vehicle this summer – serious enough to require towing of the vehicles.
14. **Site grading.** The massive grading of the entire parcel at the outset of the project is troubling. The Town should limit the amount of land that can be graded to one street or 10 -15 lots at any one time. We don’t want to be stuck with unsightly vacant lots with weeds and dust in the event of an economic downturn. No more than 4-5 houses should be under construction at any one time to lessen construction activity impact.
15. **Change in home prices.** The Town should not allow a decrease in product type/quality even if economy goes bad. The Town should also require high-end base level interior finishes (make sure the base level of interior finish is nice and consistent with high end homes). If high-end homes cannot be built due to economic conditions, the homebuilder will likely pressure the Town to build



tract homes on the vacant lots. This discussion should be considered in public now, instead of when the Town is under pressure to cover up the vacant lots.

- 16. Blind Curves.** The staff recommendations and traffic studies do not address the existing “blind curves” along Fairway. It is already difficult for some homeowners to safely back out of their driveways along Fairway. With more traffic, the situation will worsen. The only way to mitigate this issue is to restrict the number of lots with access to Fairway to 12. The winding curves along Fairway were simply not designed to handle more traffic volume.
- 17. Additional Safety Measures.** If there are more than 12 lots with access to Fairway, the Town will unfortunately need to consider a multitude of safety and infrastructure improvements – all of which should be at the expense of the developer. Such items should include, but not be limited to, the following: signage/stripping to require all vehicles to yield to pedestrians, carts, golf course maintenance equipment and bikes in large crossing areas; additional crosswalks at several locations (with signage in the road similar to Main Street in Littleton); radar signs to indicate speed with flashing lights for going over the limit (just to give a sense of control over speed); completion off-site trail connections (to provide alternate routes for pedestrians and bikes); road reinforcement/repairs in some areas along Fairway and Club (curves and dips) and the bridge; and bridge widening or new separate bridge for pedestrians. The residents may not be in favor of all these items because they will change the charm and character of Old Town. However, they may be necessary if there are more than 12 lots with access to Fairway.
- 18. School District Input.** The Town should seek more input from the school district. Perhaps the developer should be required to “donate” land to be used for educational use. Such land should be “developable” (as opposed to wetlands) and could be used for a wildlife education center or 4H type activities ect. The land should be deeded to the school district and set aside until the Town or school district can afford a building or other development.

I truly appreciate the time and effort of the staff, consultants and the board in working through these difficult issues.

**Stephen J. Ismert**

Kutak Rock LLP

1801 California Street, Suite 3000

Denver, Colorado 80202

Phone: (303) 297-2400

Direct Dial: (303) 292-7830

-----  
Dear J.D.,

We are writing to express our very strong concerns with the proposals submitted for the development of Wild Plum Farm.

To date there have been five submitted proposals. Why is this?

Is the developer attempting to confuse the issue while portraying a position of accommodating the concerns of the community?

One of the concerns is the high density and yet that issue has not been adjusted down in any of the proposals.

The proposed 105 new homes will greatly increase the traffic and safety of our community, which is another concern. Sidewalks and a timed gate are certainly not feasible solutions.

CalAtlantic is a tract home builder. A tract home project does not compliment or enhance the character of our community.

Currently the highest price home in Colorado on the CalAtlantic website is located at 15467 West 50th Place in Golden, at Table Mountain Estates. This home is priced at \$714,739.

We encourage the Board to visit this community to see the CalAtlantic product before making this important decision. CalAtlantis is not a custom home builder.

This is the wrong proposed development for Wild Plum Farm.

We have stated in previous letters, we are not opposed to development. We feel any development should be reasonable, responsible and in the best interest of our community.

We have watched Columbine Valley change with the approval and development of both Willowcroft and Wilder Lane.

We hope that you will consider and hear all the comments and concerns of the residents of our community, and listen to their voices this time.

Please deny this proposal for the development of Wild Plum Farm.  
It is not consistent or harmonious with our unique community.

Sincerely,

Nick Nichelson and Ginny Rogliano  
15 Driver Lane

---

**From:** <[Adam.Dalmy@wellsfargo.com](mailto:Adam.Dalmy@wellsfargo.com)>  
**Date:** August 18, 2016 at 11:36:35 AM MDT  
**To:** <[jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org](mailto:jdmccrumb@columbinevalley.org)>  
**Cc:** <[mbratcher@columbinecountryclub.org](mailto:mbratcher@columbinecountryclub.org)>, <[kristin.dalmy@gmail.com](mailto:kristin.dalmy@gmail.com)>  
**Subject: Plan Revision 4 & 5**

JD - We would request that you make this email a part of the submittal to the Planning & Zoning Board for the August 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Please confirm via a reply to this email that it will be.

The Town of Columbine Valley Master Plan starts by saying "The Town of Columbine Valley grew out of the development of the Columbine Country Club." The Club is, and always has been the focal point of the Town and it is why it has grown and become a quiet, unique, serene, and special Town where residents, kids and golfers generally get around by walking, biking or on golf carts. The Club is thriving based on the members'

and Board's vision of a beautiful new club house, the historic championship golf course, and the family friendly swim, tennis, and numerous kids programs that have been created. New membership is up and predicted soon to be at capacity.

Fairway Lane is a road that cuts through a private championship golf course where golf carts cross the road at 4 points, and the road narrows into a bridge that is not wide enough for golf carts and motor vehicles let alone pedestrians to cross at the same time with blind curves. It is an aesthetic, historic bridge that defines the neighborhood with its beautiful flowers. An additional 440 cars per day from the new Plum Farm residents, 4 years of construction traffic cutting through the golf course and in front of the Club, and most importantly cut-through traffic from Platte Canyon and Bowles could ruin the Club, new Clubhouse or not. I can only imagine the news headlines when a car is in a rush trying to by-pass Platte Canyon traffic hits a golf cart, a child on a bicycle or pedestrian on the bridge or at Club Ln because of the congestion created by the cut-through traffic and additional 440 cars per day. It will severely damage if not ruin the Club. Great golf clubs do not have a public thorough-fare going through the middle of the golf course at 4 points where golf carts cross, and it's naïve to think that won't occur with GPS. The Town Planner's "informal" 2 day study of potential cut through traffic is neither scientific and his most recent staff report admits the "Traffic Study does not account for golf cart, bicycle and pedestrian traffic and the potential conflict with automobiles". And most certainly does not account for the numerous Club members who do not live in the Town, but drive to the Club. People who live in the Town generally walk, bike or golf cart to the Club and it's amenities, or to just get around Town. The Town Planner's informal study which again is far from scientific showed a total number of conflicts with a 16 hour observation (which was not continuous but chopped up over 2 days) had a total of 128 observed conflicts in 16 hours between auto/pedestrian/bike/golf cart/service carts. I think that is significant. Multiply that by a week when there is a golf tournament or swim, tennis, golf practice for children. We recently have already had a hit-and-run pedestrian accident, as well as a golf cart accident. Cut through traffic already occurs with traffic on Middlefield and Club Ln. Generally people who live in the Town of Columbine respect pedestrians, kids, bicycles, golf carts and golfers. Cut through non- resident traffic in a hurry does not.

The Master Plan confirms and encourages all of this:

"To develop, through future development approvals and acquisitions if necessary, a cart path and pedestrian trail connecting the Town's neighborhoods to enhance a sense of community and identification within the Town" page 11 (This does not mean vehicular traffic as the Town Planner proposes)

"To encourage environmentally sensitive activities, such as reducing vehicular travel" page 12

"To encourage community and landowner activities, such as reducing vehicle travel;....." page 12

“Improve the connectivity between and among the Town’s neighborhoods through hike and bike trails, golf cart paths, and wide, improved shoulders along the Town’s roadways” page 14 (not sidewalks, flashing gates, and widening a historic beautiful bridge as the Town Planner proposes)

The Town Planner in his report at page 18 actually cites the above Master Plan section, but uses it to justify unrestricted access to Fairway Lane rather than just emergency/pedestrian/golf cart access, by saying “Only full access to Fairway Lane would provide all WPF residents with an optional vehicular access to the Club and other areas of the Town....”. That however is not true, they would have vehicular access through Hunter Run Lane and onto Fairway Lane from there, just like other HOA neighborhoods which enjoy the cul-de-sac character of their neighborhoods and don’t have direct vehicular access, such as Burning Tree and Polo Meadows. There is precedent for these types of single point ingress/egress neighborhoods in the Town such as Brookhaven and Willowcroft . Few neighborhoods have such direct vehicular access to the Club and must weave their way there through different streets and I believe generally prefer to walk, bike or golf cart there anyway.

“The Town envisions residential development in keeping with the present character of the community” page 18 of the Mater Plan

An additional 440 cars and cut through traffic will create congestion and serious safety issues all along Fairway Ln and at the intersection of Club Ln and Fairway and along Club to Middlefield for all Town residents and their kids who bike, walk and golf cart to the swimming pool, tennis courts and new Clubhouse or just enjoy the quiet beauty of the Town of Columbine. The congestion will also affect Club members who do not live in the surrounding neighborhoods but drive there. All Club members want a serene, quiet, private setting for their new club house, and not a public thorough-fare where there is cut through traffic and congestion at the front door of the Club and throughout the golf course. If the Club dies so does the Town of Columbine and all the HOA’s. The Town of Columbine was built around the Club and that’s what makes it great. I encourage you to maintain the unique character of the Town.

Adam & Kristin Dalmy  
32 Fairway Lane  
Columbine Valle, CO

