

**Rezoning from A (Agriculture) to RPD (Residential Planned Development) and Preliminary Development Plan, Preliminary Subdivision Plat Approval.  
Wild Plum Farm. Applicant: JPB Holdings LLC, Property Owner: Wild Plum Farm LLC by Robert Tuck.**

**I. Background**

On June 14<sup>th</sup> the Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed Preliminary Development Plan for WPF (Wild Plum Farm). At the hearing the staff presented their report which included a description of the plan and partial findings. The applicant made a presentation as did the HOA's from Old Town, Burning Tree and Polo Meadows. A large number of residents had signed up to speak but due to time constraints, only a few were heard. The hearing was continued until August 23<sup>rd</sup>.

In response to some of the concerns expressed at the June 14<sup>th</sup> hearing the applicant has made some major revisions to the preliminary plan. The revisions modify both the plan configuration and the development standards. The applicant has submitted two major options in their revisions and those options are shown in the following section.

The primary issues, traffic, development standards and architectural design remain the same and this report concentrates on those issues as they are affected by the revised plans. The full staff report has not been revised and is not included in the information sent to the Planning Commission or HOA's.

**II. Description of the Revised Documents**

The revised development plan(s) show the revised plan configurations, two options for development standards, a revised Letter of Intent and photos of homes build by CalAtlantic in other areas.

- A. The revised plan configurations contain some minor differences but are essentially the same in terms of lot locations and street alignments. The project is now divided into three sections:
  - 1. Thirteen units (or twelve) that access directly onto Fairway Lane.
  - 2. A cul de sac containing 22 lots accessing off from Fairway Lane. This section has no connection to the remainder of WPF.
  - 3. The remaining 70(or 71) lots which are assembled into separate cul de sacs but are interconnected and all would have to access via Hunter Run.
  
- B. The two variations in development standards are shown on Table 1.

**Table 1**

Development Standard	As submitted		Revision #4		Revision #5	
	28 April		August 6		August 8	
No. of Lots	105		105		105	
Density (DU's Acre)	1.0		1.0		1.0	
Lot Sizes (S.F.)						
Minimum	10,000		13,750		11,750	
Largest	20,000		38,350		25,000	
Average	13,000		21,780		17,000	
Set Backs	Filing 1	Filing 2	Filing 1	Filing 2	Filing 1	Filing 2
Front	30'	25'	30'	25'	30'	25'
Side	15'	7.5'	15'	15'	15'	15'
Rear	40'	25'/15'*	40'	25'/15'*	40'	25'/15'*
Min. Dist. Between Structures	30'	15'	30'	30'	30'	30'
% Common Open Space	55.9%		41%		52.4 %	
*Shorter setback where abutting common open space.						

- C. Preliminary Plat: A revised Preliminary Plat has not been submitted and will not be submitted until a decision is made on the revisions.
- D. The Landscape Plan consisted of 12 sheets and they were described in the original full staff report. While the open space and landscape design may change, depending on the revision, the description of proposed plantings have not be revised.
- E. Architectural Illustrations: The revised architectural illustrations are attached. These represent the architectural style of the units that CalAtlantic proposes to build. The applicant also submitted photos of units built in other locations. These are not intended to show what the applicant intends to build but are indicators of the quality of development that Cal Atlantic can build. Both the revised architectural elevations and the photos are attached and have been sent to the HOA's.

### **III. Traffic Impact Study**

At The June 14<sup>th</sup> hearing the Town's Traffic Engineer presented the Phase II Traffic Study which contains the estimated traffic volumes, directional distribution and turn movements that would be generated by the 105 residential units that are proposed. The study was included in the June 14<sup>th</sup> full staff report.

In summary, the study estimated that the proposed Wild Plum project at build out would generate an average daily traffic of 1,100 trips per day. Approximately 83 trips would occur in the AM peak hour and 110 trips would occur in the PM peak hour. Since the original submittal, the Wild Plum site plan has been revised to split the development into two enclaves; as result 32% of the traffic from Wild Plum will access via Fairway Lane and 68% will access from Hunter Run Lane.

The Level of Service analysis conducted for the original site plan was updated to reflect the change in site layout. The LOS projections were that Fairway Lane would remain at a LOS A/B (AM/PM). with the projected WPF traffic while the Hunter Run/Platte Canyon intersection would operate at a LOS C/D. The Bowles/Middlefield intersection would remain at an LOS B/B and the remainder of the internal Town intersections would remain at an LOS A/A.

Under the most recent plan revision, the total traffic volumes do not change. There would be a minor difference in the traffic distribution with 8 fewer trips via Fairway Lane and 8 more trips via Hunter Run Lane during the a.m. peak. During the p.m. peak, there would be 12 fewer trips along Fairway Lane and a corresponding increase along Hunter Run Lane.

At the June 14<sup>th</sup> hearing considerable time was given to the Traffic Engineer's report and there were a number of comments and questions from the public as well as P&Z members. In response the staff has undertaken additional research and data collection concerning the following issues.

- A. The potential for "cut-through" traffic. The concern was that during the AM peak hour, northbound drivers on Platte Canyon Road would "cut through" at Hunters Run to Fairway Lane thence to Bowles Avenue to save time.
- B. Validity of the distribution of site traffic to the access points (Hunter Run Lane and Fairway Lane). Based upon the WPF site layout and informal travel time runs conducted by staff, it was estimated that 60% of the WPF traffic would exit the site via Hunter Run Lane and 40% would exit via Fairway Lane. The concern expressed

was whether the Hunter Run-Bowles Ave route is actually faster or whether more drivers would choose the Fairway Lane –Bowles Route.

In response to these concerns, the staff conducted additional travel time runs on Tuesday, July 12th and Tuesday, July 19th. The Table below illustrates the driving time for each route. The Hunter Run-Bowles Avenue route starts at the eastern terminus of Hunters Run (the westernmost Tuck property line) and ends at the Bowles Avenue-Middlefield Road intersection. The Fairway to Bowles Avenue route starts midway along the Tuck property frontage on Fairway Lane and proceeds to the Bowles Avenue-Middlefield Road intersection (via Club Lane and Middlefield Road).

**Table 2**  
**Driving Time Comparisons**

Date: July 12, 2016

<b>Hunter Run to Middlefield/ Bowles</b>	<b>Travel Time (min:sec)</b>	<b>Fairway Frontage to Middlefield/Bowles</b>	<b>Travel Time (min: sec)</b>
<b>Start Time</b>		<b>Start Time</b>	
7:00 AM	4:23	7:00 AM	4:15
7:09 AM	3:28	7:10 AM	4:19
7:21 AM	4:57	7:22 AM	4:29
7:32 AM	4:41	7:32 AM	4:49
7:42 AM	3:59	7:43 AM	5:04
7:53 AM	3:56	7:55 AM	4:39
8:05 AM	3:25	8:03 AM	4:18
8:14 AM	3:33	8:16 AM	4:15
8:26 AM	3:30	8:23 AM	4:10
8:34 AM	4:44	8:36 AM	4:24
8:46 AM	3:46	8:46 AM	5:05
8:57 AM	2:59	8:57 AM	4:34
<b>Average (AM Peak)</b>	<b>3:56</b>	<b>Average (AM Peak)</b>	<b>4:31</b>
<b>Middlefield/Bowles to Hunter Run via Platte Canyon</b>	<b>Travel Time (min:sec)</b>	<b>Middlefield Bowles to Fairway Frontage</b>	<b>Trip Time (min:sec)</b>
<b>Start Time</b>		<b>Start Time</b>	
4:00 PM	4:11	4:00 PM	4:34
4:13 PM	4:38	4:13 PM	4:29
4:24 PM	6:13	4:24 PM	5:06

4:36 PM	4:59	4:38 PM	4:56
4:49 PM	5:22	4:48 PM	4:58
4:58 PM	6:05	5:01 PM	4:49
5:14 PM	4:48	5:12 PM	5:03
5:24 PM	5:10	5:24 PM	4:58
5:36 PM	8:15	5:36 PM	4:31
5:49 PM	6:35	5:50 PM	5:27
<b>Average (PM Peak)</b>	<b>5:37</b>	<b>Average (PM Peak)</b>	<b>4:53</b>

Date: July 19, 2016

<b>Hunter Run to Middlefield/ Bowles</b>	<b>Travel Time (min:sec)</b>	<b>Fairway Frontage to Middlefield/Bowles</b>	<b>Travel Time (min: sec)</b>
<b>Start Time</b>		<b>Start Time</b>	
7:00 AM	3:30	7:00 AM	3:54
7:08 AM	2:44	7:11 AM	4:26
7:20 AM	4:20	7:16 AM	4:01
7:25 AM	4:44	7:31 AM	4:29
7:40 AM	4:35	7:36 AM	4:55
7:47 AM	4:30	7:51 AM	4:27
8:02 AM	3:28	7:59 AM	4:45
8:10 AM	3:27	8:12 AM	5:00
8:22AM	4:53	8:19 AM	4:07
8:29AM	3:44	8:34 AM	4:25
8:46 AM	3:58	8:38 AM	4:04
8:49 AM	3:58	8:53 AM	4:20
<b>Average (AM Peak)</b>	<b>3:59</b>	<b>Average (AM Peak)</b>	<b>4:24</b>
<b>Middlefield/Bowles to Hunter Run via Platte Canyon</b>	<b>Travel Time (min:sec)</b>	<b>Middlefield Bowles to Fairway Frontage</b>	<b>Trip Time (min:sec)</b>
<b>Start Time</b>		<b>Start Time</b>	
4:00 PM	5:53	4:01 PM	4:25
4:12 PM	4:42	4:13 PM	4:40
4:22 PM	4:31	4:22 PM	4:40
4:25 PM	4:43	4:36 PM	4:33
4:51 PM	6:14	4:45 PM	5:07
4:59 PM	5:21	5:02 PM	5:09
5:13 PM	5:02	5:10 PM	5:02
5:22 PM	4:57	5:24 PM	4:55
5:37 PM	6:03	5:34 PM	5:21

5:49 PM	5:21	5:52 PM	4:22
<b>Average (PM Peak)</b>	<b>5:16</b>	<b>Average (PM Peak)</b>	<b>4:49</b>

C. The Traffic Study does not account for golf cart, bicycle and pedestrian traffic and the potential conflict with automobiles.

In response, the staff conducted activity counts of the vehicle, golf cart, bicycle and pedestrian traffic on Wednesday, July 27<sup>th</sup> and Thursday, July 28<sup>th</sup>. These counts were taken at four locations from 7:00-9:30 a.m.; 10:30 a.m.-1:30 p.m.; 2:30-5:00 p.m.

The location and counts are illustrated in Table 3:

Table 3  
 Summary of Columbine Valley Activity Counts  
 AM (PM) Peak Hour

Travel mode	Location			
	SE Side Fairway Bridge AM (PM)	Corner Club & Fairway AM (PM)	Club Ln at Nevada Ditch Bridge AM (PM)	Eastern Intersection Club & Wedge AM (PM)
Golf & Service Carts	<b>88 (88)</b>	<b>64 (66)</b>	<b>53 (58)</b>	<b>23 (25)</b>
Bicycles	<b>7 (9)</b>	<b>9 (15)</b>	<b>9 (6)</b>	<b>3 (3)</b>
Pedestrians	<b>22 (9)</b>	<b>19 (8)</b>	<b>15 (20)</b>	<b>16 (6)</b>
Autos/Trucks	<b>111 (104)</b>	<b>157 (164)</b>	<b>116 (120)</b>	<b>51 (55)</b>

Golf carts represent a significant proportion of traffic along Columbine Valley's streets (approximately 1/3 of all motorized traffic are golf carts / service carts). Many service vehicles were observed using public streets to access various locations around the golf course.

The data collected indicates that the highest overall activity occurs from mid-morning (10:30 a.m.) to early afternoon (1:30 p.m.) at the locations in the immediate vicinity of the Columbine Country Club (Fairway Bridge, Club & Fairway, Nevada Ditch Bridge). For the most part, these periods are the most intensive for motorized (autos, trucks, and carts) vehicles. Pedestrian and bicycle activity tends to peak outside of this time period, either in the early morning or mid-afternoon. In general, pedestrian and bicycle traffic was intermittent throughout the day. The greatest number of pedestrians and bicyclists recorded at any location over a fifteen-minute interval was 9 and 11, respectively.

The Club & Wedge location experiences relatively even levels of activity throughout the day.

In addition to collecting the traffic counts described above, staff also made observations and recorded conflicts (whether involving golf carts, pedestrians, bicyclists, or autos) at each location. In this case, a "conflict" was observed whenever an automobile or golf cart was required to change their travel path, slow, or stop to avoid a pedestrian, cyclist, or other motorized or non-motorized travel mode. Whether the conflict required a passing maneuver, vehicle slowing, or vehicle stopping was also recorded as a surrogate for the magnitude of the conflict observed. This information is summarized in the following table:

Table 4  
 Total Number of Observed Conflicts  
 (Based on 16 hours of observation)

Conflict Type	Location			
	SE Side Fairway Bridge	Corner Club & Fairway	Club Ln at Nevada Ditch Bridge	Eastern Intersection Club & Wedge
Auto v. Ped/Bike				
Pass	15	1	14	3
Slow	7	0	12	1
Stop	0	1	0	0
Auto v. Cart/Service				
Pass	12	3	4	4
Slow	18	2	2	3
Stop	1	0	1	0
Cart/Service v. Ped/Bike				
Pass	3	4	4	0
Slow	3	0	2	0
Stop	0	0	0	0
Autos v. Auto				
Cart/Service v. Cart/Service				
Pass	2	0	0	0
Slow	4	0	1	0

Stop	1	0	0	0
<b>Total Conflicts</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>11</b>

As illustrated in the previous table, the greatest number of conflicts was recorded in the vicinity of the Fairway Lane Bridge.

D. The volume of traffic exiting and entering Hunter Run at Platte Canyon is a concern.

1. The Preliminary Development Plan and the Phase II Traffic Study were referred to CDOT and their initial response was:

*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.*

2. Residents have also requested that application be made for a traffic signal at the Hunter Run/Platte Canyon intersection. Such an application can only be made with approval of the Board of Trustees. Furthermore, CDOT has confirmed that a traffic signal cannot be constructed unless duly warranted according to Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) criteria. Using the Applicant's revised site plan, a peak hour traffic signal warrant analysis was conducted.
3. Existing delays for traffic exiting from Hunter Run Lane is a concern. On Wednesday, July 20th the staff conducted a video recording of the approach to determine the typical waiting time for a vehicle to enter Platte Canyon Road from Hunter Run Lane. The study results found that the average delay for left turning vehicles was 16 seconds. Right turning vehicles were delayed by 10 seconds on average.

#### **IV. Report of the Town Engineer**

The Town Engineer is responsible for the initial evaluation of proposed road way, drainage and water quality aspects of the proposed development and their report was included in the June 14<sup>th</sup> report. A summary of their comments on the revisions and any new information from the referral agencies follows:

2 Middlefield Road  
Columbine Valley, CO 80123

**RE: Wild Plum**

Mr. Sieber:

After the June 14, 2016 The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, ICON Engineering has continued investigations related to the proposed Wild Plum development. Please see below for additional information about this project.

1. **Stormwater.** It is our understanding that the Applicant may be requesting a variance for no onsite stormwater detention and only water quality treatment for the project site. An official request has not been submitted. The justification for considering no detention is that the site is a small sub-basin at the downstream limit of a large drainage basin. The "beat the peak" approach would allow the site to discharge stormwater ahead of peak flows from the overall basin and have less impact on the downstream system, the South Platte River.

The concept for no stormwater detention has been discussed with UDFCD (Urban Drainage and Flood Control District) and SSPRD (South Suburban Park and Recreation District). UDFCD does not support or oppose this approach and

indicated that it would be a Town decision. SSPRD does not have concerns with this option. A discussion with the City of Littleton on this matter is still necessary.

**2. US Army Corps of Engineers Easements.** Existing USACE easements at the east end of the Wild Plum site overlap with the South Platte River FEMA flood hazard area. Each easement has specific requirements:

- Wing Dike Easement- *located adjacent to golf course on north boundary* - Only fences allowed
- Floodway Easement- *triangular piece on southeast corner of property* - No structures other than "park shelters" (not enclosed, no foundation); no grading that impacts flooding
- Ponding Easement- *diagonal piece northwest of floodway easement* - Can be filled and developed if raised above elevation 5342.5; FEMA LOMR required  
The May submittal indicated only trail and minor earthwork encroachments in these easements, but did not include the floodplain analysis to prove no-rise.

**3. Hunter Run Ln.** Offsite roadway improvements for Hunter Run Ln, between S. Platte Canyon Rd and Wild Plum have not been submitted. The existing ROW at Hunter Run Ln is 60-ft. The existing roadway section has curb and gutter and approximately 28-ft pavement width at the east and west ends. The majority of the road has a 5-ft wide landscaped median with only 10-ft lane widths on either side.

The TCV typical roadway section for 60-ft ROW (minor collector) does not include a median or curb and gutter. Instead it includes drainage pans and 40-ft pavement width. If a median is considered, the Littleton Fire Protection District will require at least 20-ft on either side of a median for emergency access.

**4. South Access.** SSPRD has confirmed that future access at the south end of the proposed development will not be feasible.

**5. Environmental.** The Applicant will need to coordinate field investigations to identify the presence of, and evaluate potential impacts to USACE jurisdictional wetlands and threatened and endangered species.

**6. Construction Management.** The Applicant will need to develop a management plan to address dust and noise potential during construction. Dust pollution management shall adhere to State Stormwater Permit requirements. Temporary perimeter sound walls may need to be considered for early stages of

construction. Behrens and Associates, Environmental Noise Control, can provide applicable services.

We look forward to continued coordination with the applicant and their engineers.  
Sincerely,  
Aaron Boussetot, PE, CFM  
ICON Engineering, Inc.

**V. Comments of The Referral Agencies**

The development proposal was referred to 22 outside agencies and all the Town's HOA's. Copies of the revised plans have been sent to the HOA's

**A. Outside Agencies**

Prior to June 14 responses had been received from Arapahoe County, South Suburban Parks and Recreation, Littleton Public Schools, City of Littleton (Planning and Engineering), Army Corps of Engineers, Tri-County Health and the Colorado Division of Wildlife. The complete responses were included in the full formal report and summarized in the Presentation Report presented at the June 14<sup>th</sup> hearing. Subsequently we have received responses from CDOT and additional comments from South Suburban Park and Recreation and the Littleton School District

The new responses are summarized in Section VII, Findings, of this report.

**B. HOA'S**

Prior to June 14 responses had been received from the following HOA's:

Old Town	Brookhaven
Burning Tree	The Village
Polo Meadows	Country Club Villas

In addition, Old Town, Burning Tree, Polo Meadows and the Village presented comments at the June 14<sup>th</sup> hearing. Any HOA comments received after June 14<sup>th</sup> as well as any comments on the revised plans are summarized in the Findings section of this report.

**C. Resident Responses**

We have received emails from Town residents which were included verbatim in the June 14<sup>th</sup> full staff report and summarized in the Presentation Report. Comments received on the revised plans are summarized in the Findings section of this report.

Complete comments received since June 14<sup>th</sup> from outside agencies, HOA's and residents are contained in a separate document which is not part of this report but a digital copy has been sent to P&Z members and HOA's.

## **VI. Findings**

The staff has reviewed the plans and supporting documents and the referral comments. We have made site visits and met with the applicant several times. We have met with representatives of the HOA's or corresponded by email with HOA representatives and residents and have had numerous telephone calls from residents with questions about the proposed development. Based on this review and communications, we offer the following findings which have been modified to reflect the revised plans, where appropriate:

### **A. Compliance with the Land Use Regulations**

The Application for Land Development contained all the required documents and, in general, does comply with the provisions of the Land Use Regulations.

### **B. Consistency with the Master Plan**

The Town of Columbine Valley Master Plan has established a Town Vision and set of Goals for Land Development. The Vision statement and Land Development Goals are intended to guide the staff, the Planning Commission and the Trustees in their evaluation and action on applications for land development. The following is a staff evaluation **(in blue font)** of how the revised proposal complies with the vision and the goals

#### **Town Vision**

- *To require future development to provide open space and parks.*

***The project as proposed would contain approximately 52.4% common open space in Revision 5 with an extensive trail system and adequate area for passive recreation. Revision 4 would retain part of the perimeter trail system but the interior trails would be eliminated.***

***Town staff prefers Revision 5 over Revision 4. Revision 5 offers more amenities to the town as a whole in that it provides more open space, larger park areas, and a trail system that anyone in the town could use for recreation, not just residents of Wild Plum. The open space provided in revision 5 is approximately 11% more than***

in revision 4 which amounts to an extra 12 acres. If the neighborhood becomes an enclave with the addition of the cul-de-sacs to limit traffic flows, the residents of this neighborhood will want pedestrian, bike and cart access to the club. Revision 5, with the additional trails makes this access a reality.

Revision 5 also has a smaller lot footprint in which new homeowners would not have to install, maintain and irrigate as large of a landscaped area. If revision 4 is used, the added 3,000 square feet of area per lot will most likely be used as open turfgrass areas which would drastically increase the water usage on the site. Revision 5 would take this 3,000 square feet per lot and make it open space which is more likely to be native grass areas which may need only initial watering to establish. The difference could be as much as 25 acre feet of water consumption annually.

- 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.

**Both revisions propose access only to Fairway Lane for 35 (or 34) of the 105 lots (33%) of the total trips) and access only to Hunter Run for the remaining 70 (or 71) lots.**

**In the Phase II Traffic Study the LOS (level of Service) on Fairway Lane is presently A/B and the plan revisions would not change that LOS rating. The LOS on Hunter Run is currently rated C/B (AM and PM) and the rating would change to a C/D.**

- *To encourage community and landowner participation and collaboration in planning decisions to allow for development.*

**On April 27 the Application for Land Development was accepted for processing. On May 10<sup>th</sup> the documents were posted on the Town' Web Site.**

**The following is a list of meetings that involved residents of the community:**

**On April 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> the applicant sponsored open house meetings at the Town Hall. The purpose of these meetings was to present the applicants proposed plan and respond to questions.**

On May 24<sup>th</sup> the Town Administrator and Town Planner met with approximately 50-60 people (primarily Old Town residents). The purpose of this meeting was for the residents to ask questions of the Town staff and to state their concerns.

On May 26<sup>th</sup> the Town Administrator and Town Planner met with members of the Polo Meadows HOA Board and on May 31<sup>st</sup> they met with approximately 20 residents of Polo Meadows. Again, the purpose of this meeting was for the residents to ask questions of the Town staff and to state their concerns.

On June 7 The Town Administrator and Town Planner met with the Burning Tree residents.

Prior to June 14<sup>th</sup> the staff received a number of emails from residents and numerous telephone calls and have continued to receive emails and telephone calls since then.

On June 14, the Planning Commission held a public hearing which was attended by over 200 people. At that hearing the HOA's from Old Town, Polo Meadows and Burning Tree spoke and a handout was received from The Village HOA. Several residents then addressed the Planning Commission but the meeting had to be continued because of the County rules about vacating the building at 10:30PM.

Since June 14<sup>th</sup> the following meetings have been held:

July 7. The Town Planner met with Garrett Baum to discuss the expectations for the continued hearing.

July 25 9:00AM. The Town Administrator and Planner met with The WPF Development Team and their attorney, and the landowner and his attorney. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the procedure for the August 23<sup>rd</sup> continued hearing and to discuss the plan revisions the applicant was considering.

July 25 3:30 PM. The Town Administrator, Attorney and Planner met with representatives of the Old Town HOA and their attorney. The general purpose was to clarify some of the issues and what additional information may be presented at the August 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting. It was also agreed that the Town would make a request to CDOT concerning the possibility of traffic signal at the Hunter Run/Platte Canyon Road intersection.

**In early August the applicant met with representatives of the Old Town HOA to discuss concerns and possible plan revisions.**

**In early August the Town Administrator and Planner met with Kent Peterson of CalAtlantic to discuss the proposed plan revisions that are now the subject of this report**

- To encourage community and landowner participation and collaboration in planning decisions to allow for development decisions to occur in a predictable, fair and inclusive manner.

**The Town staff has had little communication with the land owner because the authority to act on his behalf has been assigned to the applicant. The landowner did address the Planning Commission at the June 14th hearing. The applicant has meet with Town staff on numerous occasions.**

**The HOA's and the public involvement were described above.**

In addition to the Town Vision Statement the Master Plan has established a set of Land Use Goals:

1. Maintain the low-density residential focus of the community.

**The plan designates the WPF property as single family residential with a density range of 0.0 to 1.0 DU's (dwelling units) per acre. The development proposal requests approval of 105 single family residential units, a density of 1.0 DU's per acre. The density of the revised plans remains the same.**

2. Insure that all future residential development is compatible with adjacent existing residential development.

**Table 1 in Section II illustrated the development stipulations of the WPF original plan and the revisions. The table is replicated below followed by Table 4 which shows the same information for the adjacent existing residential development. Table 4 has been revised to include The Village and the Littleton developments are no longer included.**

**Table 1**

Development Standard	As submitted 28 April		Revision #4 August 6		Revision #5 August 6	
	No. of Lots	105		105		105
Density (DU's Acre)	1.0		1.0		1.0	
Lot Sizes (S.F.)						
Minimum	10,000		13,750		11,750	
Largest	20,000		38,350		25,000	
Average	13,000		21,780		17,000	
Set Backs	Filing 1	Filing 2	Filing 1	Filing 2	Filing 1	Filing 2
Front	30'	25'	30'	25'	30'	25'
Side	15'	7.5'	15'	15'	15'	15'
Rear*	40'	25'/15'*	40'	25'/15'*	40'	25'/15'*
Min. Dist. Between Structures	30'	15'	30'	30'	30'	30'
% Common Open Space	55.9%		41%		52.4 %	

\*Shorter setback where abutting common open space.

**Table 4\_**

Development # of Lots	Old Town	Polo Meadows	Burning Tree	The Village
	178	18	122	60
Density DU's Acre	1.67	1.26	2.40	2.34
Max. Height	25'	35'	27'	Not Stated
Min. Lot Size(S.F.)	15,000	19,900	10,000	10,454
Largest Lot Size	47,700	32,600	29,300	26,234
Average Lot Size	20,800	22,500	14,521	14,222
Setbacks*				
Front	30'	15'	25'	25'
Front (garage)				
Side	15'	15'	10'	10'
Rear	40'	15'	25' or 15' for certain lots	20'
Minimum Between	30'	30'	20'	20'

<b>Structure</b>				
<b>% Common Open Space</b>	<b>Virtually 0%</b>	<b>10% (Est)</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>7% (Est)</b>

The revised lot sizes are significantly larger than the original submittal. Average lot size in Revision 4 is smaller than Polo Meadows and larger than those in the other neighborhoods. Lot sizes in Revision 5 are smaller than Polo Meadows and Old Town and larger than in Burning Tree and The Village.

The side yard setbacks have been increased from 7.5' to 15' and are now equal or greater than the other neighborhoods. The front set back remains as they were and at 30'/25' (Filing 1/Filing2) and are greater than Polo Meadows and roughly equivalent to the remainder. The rear setbacks at 25' (15' where abutting open space)' are roughly equivalent to the other neighborhoods.

The amount of common open space in both Revision 4 (41%) and Revision 5 (52.4%) is significantly greater than any of the other neighborhoods.

These tables are intended to show a development standards comparison between WPF and the other neighborhoods. Development standards, by themselves, do not necessary show whether one development is compatible with another but they are an element in those determinations. The revised development standards are comparable to those of the other neighborhoods and the amount of common open space is significantly higher than any of the other neighborhoods. Therefore it is the staff opinion that the full assessment of the compatibility finding requires an evaluation of the proposed architectural standards and those are addressed in Subsection E (page\_\_\_).

- 3 Insure that new streets are built as wide, two lane roads with generous rooms for pedestrians, bicycles and golf cats in keeping with existing streets.,

**The local streets proposed in WPF comply with the standards required In Article X, Section 1(Streets)). The R-O-W is 50' with a travel surface of 36'. This allows for two travel lanes and 6' parking lanes on each side.**

4. Encourage the use of the planned development process, where appropriate, to (a) achieve a more efficient use of infrastructure improvements and services, where community facilities and services are adequate and (b) promote pedestrian and community accessibility.

The application requests approval of rezoning from A (Agriculture) to RPD (Planned Development) that requires approval of a preliminary and final plan. The street layout is designed to serve the development in an efficient manner and the inclusion of trails and access onto Fairway Lane is designed to provide pedestrian and community accessibility.

5. Encourage the protection of important wildlife habitat and significant natural landforms.

The preliminary development plan was referred to the Colorado Division of Wildlife and their response was included in previous reports. A copy of their response was sent to the applicant and the applicant will be required to comply with the Division of Wildlife requirements for wildlife protection and habitat preservation.

6. Insure that new development enhances or has no adverse effects upon the Town's property tax base and financial viability.

The applicant has estimated that the sales prices of the homes proposed would range from \$800,000 to \$1,200,000. The table below illustrates the estimated revenues the Town could expect from three differently priced units.

Table 5

Sales Price	Use Tax*	Bldg. Permit Fee*	Impact Fee	Total Per Unit
\$800,000	\$12,000	\$6,300	\$12,700	\$31,000
\$1,000,000	\$15,000	\$7,600	\$12,700	\$35,300
\$1,200,000	\$19,500	\$8,600	\$12,700	\$40,800

- The Use Tax and Building Permit Fee are based on construction cost.

The revenues cited above are one time revenues. There would be ongoing revenues including property tax, sales tax on "big ticket" items such as automobiles and other fees.

There would be cost to serve the new development including new capital equipment for public works, police and Town Administration. It is anticipated that the revenues generated would be sufficient to pay the costs.

7. 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.

**The original plan proposed three points of access, one via Hunter Run and two access points on Fairway Lane. The plan revisions still provide access to Hunter Run and Fairway Lane but the access to Fairway Lane is limited to 35 (or 34) lots. 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. The plan revisions still propose a system of trails that would be available to other residents of the Town but the Revision 5 system includes extensive perimeter and interior trails while Revision 4 is limited to a partial perimeter trail.**

#### C. Traffic Impact

In Section III we summarized the elements of the Phase II Traffic Study that was presented at the June 14<sup>th</sup> hearing. We also described the additional research and data collections that have occurred in response to direction from the Planning Commission and resident concerns. The staff findings resulting from the additional data collection are:

1. The potential for "cut-through" traffic. The concern was that during the AM peak hour, northbound drivers on Platte Canyon Road would "cut through at Hunters Run Lane to Fairway Lane thence to Bowles Avenue to save time.

The concern expressed was whether the Hunter Run Lane to Bowles Avenue route is actually faster or whether more drivers would choose to cut-through Wild Plum via Fairway Lane to Bowles Avenue.

Although there can be other reasons for cut-through traffic, the primary motivation is to minimize personal travel time. The timed runs show that the Hunter Run Lane to Bowles Avenue via Platte Canyon Road takes less time (30 seconds on average) than cutting through Old Town in the AM peak hour. However, due to congestion at the Platte Canyon / Bowles Avenue intersection, the timed runs for the PM peak hour revealed that the potential exists for the Bowles Avenue to Fairway Lane route to be an equivalent or marginally faster route to Platte Canyon during the p.m. peak hour. For this reason, the potential exists for the route to attract cut through traffic in the afternoon during periods of intense congestion along Bowles Avenue and Platte Canyon Road.

The revised plan proposes a closed system that forces 33% of the traffic onto Fairway Lane and 67% onto Hunter Run Lane. It is staff's opinion that a permanently closed system such as is currently proposed is unnecessary since the traffic distribution could be managed using a timed gate system. A timed gate system would enable the neighborhood to be unified during off-peak and weekend time periods.

The City of Littleton installed a timed gate system in Bow Mar South several years ago to address a cut-through traffic problem. The magnitude of the cut-through problem was quantified first by conducting a license plate survey that identified approximately 40 percent of the traffic in the neighborhood was cutting through.

According to staff, the gate system has accomplished its intended purpose, although there was some initial push back from residents. There were also a few unintended consequences. For example, a resident adjacent to the gate had to install a berm in his yard in order to discourage traffic from driving across his lawn.

2. The Traffic Study does not account for golf cart, bicycle and pedestrian traffic and the potential conflict with automobiles.

In response, the staff conducted activity counts of the vehicle, golf cart, bicycle and pedestrian traffic on Wednesday, July 27<sup>th</sup> and Thursday, July 28<sup>th</sup> at four locations.

Based on the data collected, golf carts represent a significant proportion of traffic along Columbine Valley's streets (approximately 1/3 of all motorized traffic are golf carts / service carts). Many service vehicles were observed using public streets to access various locations around the golf course.

The data collected indicates that the highest overall activity occurs from mid-morning (10:30 a.m.) to early afternoon (1:30 p.m.) at the locations in the immediate vicinity of the Columbine Country Club (Fairway Bridge, Club & Fairway, Nevada Ditch Bridge). For the most part, these periods are the most intensive for motorized (autos, trucks, and carts) vehicles. Pedestrian and bicycle activity tends to peak outside of this time period, either in the early morning or mid-afternoon. In general, pedestrian and bicycle traffic was intermittent throughout the day. The greatest number of pedestrians and bicyclists recorded at any location over a fifteen-minute interval was 9 and 11, respectively.

The Town researched traffic crashes and determined that over the past three years there were no crashes resulting in injury within the Town, or crashes involving pedestrians, or bicyclists.

In addition to collecting the activity counts described above, staff also made observations and recorded conflicts (whether involving golf carts, pedestrians, bicyclists, or autos) at each location. In this case, a “conflict” was observed whenever an automobile or golf cart was required to change their travel path, slow, or stop to avoid a pedestrian, cyclist, or other motorized or non-motorized travel mode. Whether the conflict required a passing maneuver, vehicle slowing, or vehicle stopping was also recorded as a surrogate for the magnitude of the conflict observed.

The greatest number of conflicts was recorded in the vicinity of the Fairway Lane Bridge. While the conflict between automobile and non-automobile traffic does not appear to create a major safety problem, the staff feels there are improvements and programs that could mitigate some of the safety concerns. With respect to the Fairway Lane Bridge, the majority of the observed conflicts were attributable to the reduced width on the bridge, which requires traffic to cross to the other side, slow, or stop to accommodate golf cart, pedestrian, and bicyclist traffic. Staff recommends that the pavement over the bridge be widened to the full bridge width to eliminate this conflict. It appears that the existing bridge is wide enough to accommodate additional pavement but that it has been artificially narrowed to provide an aesthetic brick wall and landscaping.

Lack of sidewalks throughout the Town also results in pedestrians having to use to street to jog, walk the dog, or otherwise take a leisurely stroll. While in the street, they compete with bicyclists, golf carts, and maintenance vehicles to use the striped shoulder that exists along all Town roadways. Many of the observed conflicts were a result of motorized vehicles crossing the centerline or otherwise swinging wide to avoid pedestrians or cyclists in the street.

One potential solution to address conflicts involving pedestrians is to create a sidewalk system along those streets that accommodate the highest levels of traffic. These include Club, Fairway, and Middlefield. Sidewalks along these roadways would likely fall outside of the public street right-of-way.

3. The volume of traffic exiting and entering Hunter Run at Platte Canyon is a concern. Platte Canyon Road is under the jurisdiction of CDOT. The Preliminary

Development Plan and the Phase II Traffic Study were referred to CDOT and they have agreed with the study recommendations, including the provision of a northbound right turn lane from Platte Canyon Road to Hunter Run Lane, improved storage for the southbound left-turn lane, improved sight distance, and street lighting.

The applicant has stated their willingness to pay for a signal at the intersection of Hunter Run Lane and Platte Canyon Road if granted by CDOT. National standards require that traffic signals only be installed where they are warranted. The primary issue at hand is whether the projected traffic from WPF would meet Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) signal warranting criteria. Traffic signals can be warranted on the basis of traffic volume, pedestrians, crash history, and other factors.

Based upon current traffic projections, the intersection of Hunter Run Lane and Platte Canyon Road is not expected to meet warrants upon development of WPF. CDOT will not approve a signal unless one or more warrants are met.

Staff recommends the following course of action:

- a. Once the WPF development has been approved, staff will prepare an access permit application that outlines the improvements necessary at the intersection of Hunter Run Lane and Platte Canyon Road. The letter of request submitted along with the application can identify the Town's desire for a traffic signal and request that the access permit terms and conditions be written to not preclude the installation of a traffic signal in the future once MUTCD warrants are met.
- b. As part of the WPF development process, require that the Applicant place in escrow an amount equal to the anticipated cost of a traffic signal (approximately \$250,000 to \$300,000). The escrowed amount could be earmarked for a traffic signal or other safety- or operational-related improvements to the intersection of Hunter Run Lane and Platte Canyon Road.
- c. Have staff monitor the intersection of Hunter Run Lane and Platte Canyon Road overtime as WPF develops and begins to fill in. Conditions to be monitored by staff include excessive delays, citizen complaints, and crashes (if they occur).

- d. Once WPF is largely developed and occupied, or when conditions at the intersection indicate, conduct a traffic signal warrant study in accordance with MUTCD guidelines.
- e. Provided the study indicates that a traffic signal is warranted, provide a copy to CDOT for their review and concurrence.

Existing delays for traffic exiting from Hunter Run Lane is a concern. On Wednesday, July 20th the staff conducted a video recording of the approach to determine the typical waiting time for a vehicle to enter Platte Canyon Road from Hunter Run Lane. The study results found that the average delay for left turning vehicles was 16 seconds (LOS C condition). Right turning vehicles were delayed by 10 seconds (LOS B condition) on average.

The traffic delays measured in the field are similar to those predicted by the traffic models and are well within an acceptable range.

D. Comments of the HOA's and Residents

We have received extensive responses from the three most affected HOA's, Old Town, Polo Meadows and Burning Tree as well as comments from Country Club Villa's, Brookhaven and the Village. In addition, we have received numerous emails from area residents. These responses were summarized in the Presentation Report at the June 14<sup>th</sup> hearing and included verbatim in the full staff report. At the hearing, representatives of the HOA presented their comments and concerns some residents had the opportunity to speak. The written and verbal responses received through June 14<sup>th</sup> primarily expressed concerns about:

1. Traffic and the projected traffic distribution.
2. The method of determining density
3. Lot sizes and setbacks
4. Architectural Quality

There have been additional comments received since June 14<sup>th</sup>. and they generally reflect the concerns listed above. The comments we have received are included in a separate document which is not part of this report but a digital copy was sent to P&Z members and HOA's. As of August 12<sup>th</sup> the only comments received on the revised plans were questions of clarification.

## E. Architectural Design

Article XI, Section 1E1 of the Land Use Regulations states:

### Preliminary Plan

At a minimum provide graphic representations showing the building types proposed. Representations should also identify the general height of dwelling units, i.e., 1-2 stories in height and graphically include the general layout and illustrative street elevations. Perspectives should be provided to clearly identify the design theme and architectural quality. *Examples of structures that the applicant has built in similar locations should be included.*

The revised architectural illustrations have been reviewed by the staff. They are an improvement over the illustrations that were originally submitted. They illustrate what the builder proposes to build at WPF. The applicant also submitted photos of residential units built in other areas in order to show that they have built units of a quality acceptable in Columbine Valley. However, these are not the homes they propose to build.

### **Summary**

In summary the staff finds that the Application of Land Development as revised is not consistent with all the Town Land Use Regulations all the Land Use Goals in the Master Plan because it does not provide access onto two public streets for all the lots and does not meet the intent of the "connectivity" goal. However, these deficiencies can easily be remedied by eliminating the closed system and connecting the primary street. With this modification, the staff finding would find that the Preliminary Development Plan:

- A. Is essentially in compliance with the Town's Land Use Regulations.
- B. Is consistent with the Land Use Goals of the Master Plan.
- C. The traffic from the proposed development will increase the volumes on the Town's existing street system but can be accommodated without a decrease in the Level of Service rating. There are time periods and locations that may experience conflict between automobile traffic and bicycle/golf cart/pedestrian traffic but that conflict does not indicate a major safety problem. There are improvements and programs that could further mitigate any conflict problems.

- D. The revised architectural illustrations do contain the basic elements required by Article XI, Section 1E1 of the Land Use Regulation for a Preliminary Development Plan. Final approval of the architectural design is a condition for approval of the Final Development Plan.

The staff has stated, on numerous occasions, that we do not have the training or professional qualifications that would allow us to make a definitive finding on design quality. We are suggesting that the Town engage the services of a qualified architect to assist staff, the Planning Commission, and Board of Trustees in evaluating the final design illustrations and to assist us in preparing detailed design standards for inclusion in the Final Development Plan.

## **VII. Recommendations**

Based on the above findings, the staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend the Preliminary Development Plan (Revision 2) favorably subject to the following conditions:

- A. Prior to the Board of Trustees meeting the applicant will:

1. Modify the plan and eliminate the closed system by eliminating the two cul de sacs.
2. Meet with representatives of South Suburban Park and Recreation District, The Division of Wildlife, Tri County Health and the City of Littleton to determine the possible plan modifications that would address their concerns.
3. Meet with the representatives of Polo meadow and Burning Tree to discuss:
  - a. The CDOT recommended improvements to the Hunter Run/Platte Canyon Road intersection and commit to the necessary improvements.
  - b. Develop a preliminary Construction Management Plan.
4. Provide a written response to the Town Engineers comments and recommendations.
5. Agree to participate in a program of improvements to Fairway Lane that would mitigate the conflicts between automobile and non automobile traffic.

6. Other conditions that may be recommended by the Planning Commission.

B. If the Trustee's approve a Preliminary Development Plan:

1. The applicant will meet with the staff and their architectural consultants to develop detailed design standards for the proposed residential units.
2. The Applicant place in escrow an amount equal to the anticipated cost of a traffic signal (approximately \$250,000 to \$300,000). The escrowed amount could be earmarked for a traffic signal or other safety- or operational-related improvements to the intersection of Hunter Run Lane and Platte Canyon Road.