

## APPENDIX A

### Referral Responses and Resident Comments Received after June 8<sup>th</sup> Through August 4<sup>th</sup> (staff report sent)

#### 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

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Bill Dotson" <[BC.Dotson@comcast.net](mailto:BC.Dotson@comcast.net)>

**Date:** August 16, 2016 at 4:21:05 PM MDT

**To:** "'Bill Dotson'" <[BC.Dotson@comcast.net](mailto:BC.Dotson@comcast.net)>

**Subject:** **FW: Please add any suggestions/Bill will you forward to the homeowners?**

**Dear Villa Avignon Homeowners,**

**We have been asked by a group of individuals in Columbine Valley to join other Columbine Valley HOAs stating our objections to the development of the Wild Plum development project. Because we have not been included in these conversations to date and have not yet had the opportunity to vet the situation as a community, the Villa Avignon board is hesitant to represent its support of the request without proper analysis. With the short amount of time to respond, we are advising Villa Avignon residents of the letter per the email string below. Since we have not been included in those discussions we suggest any resident comments and feedback be provided at the upcoming hearing on Aug 23 or in writing to the Town Planner. Details on the August 23 meeting will be sent to you separately. It should be pointed out that the opinions expressed in the letter may or may not be factual and that the developer has not had the opportunity to rebut the claims that are being made.**

**Regards,  
Ralph Armijo**

## **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 Willow croft 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 residence 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 preposed 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@ckbirlaw.com](mailto:bbrittan@ckbirlaw.com) [www.ckbirlaw.com](http://www.ckbirlaw.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,

In the Arapahoe County Planners report on the Littleton Valley Vistas proposal by KB Homes, which of course is opposed by the Town, the planner recommends that the application be denied per the language below:

"Staff: Staff recommends the application be denied because it does not generally conform to and does not otherwise achieve the goals of the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan identifies the parcel as Urban Residential, which allows a density range of 6 to 12 du/ac for single family attached and small multi-family. The proposed density of 8.85 du/ac falls within the recommended density range, but other guiding principles need to be taken into consideration such as compatibility with surrounding development..."

My question is, does the Columbine Valley Planning Staff have the prerogative to make a recommendation to deny a proposal that may technically meet requirements "but other guiding principles need to be taken into consideration such as compatibility with surrounding development..."?

Thanks,

Dick Nieder  
17 Wedge Way

---

To: The Columbine Valley Planning and Zoning Commission  
From: Homeowners bordering Hunter Run Lane  
RE: Concerns relating to the Wild Plum Farm development (WPF)

July 25, 2016

We appreciate the opportunity to present our concerns to the Planning and Zoning Commission as you undertake the due diligence process associated with making recommendations to the Columbine Valley Board of Trustees.

As residents of the Town of Columbine Valley (Town), and of the Burning Tree and Polo Meadows neighborhoods, and one home in unincorporated Arapahoe County, we have two main concerns. First is the safety and mobility of all residents as it relates to the increased traffic associated with the 105-unit WPF. Second is the noise and air pollution that will specifically affect our homes and quality of life along Hunter Run Lane as one of the ingress and egress points to the development.

In the preliminary plan presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission, there are two distinct access points to the development: Fairway Lane and Hunter Run Lane. We understand the residents of Old Town have petitioned to allow only the 11 houses that abut Fairway Lane to have access to Fairway Lane, while the remaining 94 houses only have ingress and egress via Hunter Run Lane. This request will negatively impact the safety and mobility of not only the 94 houses in the proposed development, but other residents of the Town and those using Platte Canyon Road as well.

Traffic using Hunter Run Lane to access Platte Canyon will be doing so right next to the Coal Mine/Platte Canyon intersection. Per the Phase II traffic study, the level of service (LOS) of this intersection is already rated an "F" at the a.m. peak hour and a "D" at the p.m. peak hour. Also per the Phase II traffic study, Hunter Run Lane will be a "C" at the a.m. peak hour and a "D" at the p.m. peak hour. It would be short-sighted and unsustainable to tax an already over-burdened intersection with nearly 90% of the proposed new development's residential traffic.

Furthermore, per the Phase II traffic study, having an access point onto Fairway Lane does not impact the LOS rating for the Fairway Lane intersection. There is no objective, compelling reason to eliminate Fairway Lane as a distinct access point for the neighborhood. Additionally, to only have one access point into the neighborhood for almost 90% of the homes creates safety risks for the new residents. Thus, using Fairway Lane for the residents of the entire new development should be allowed from the time the first new home is sold.

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