

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

I. Purpose and Location

This is a request for rezoning and preliminary approval of a 95 unit residential development on a 105 acre site. The applicant proposes to develop all the lots as single family residential.

The property is located in the southern part of the Town. It is bounded on the north by Fairway Lane, on the east and southeast by the South Platte River corridor and South Plat Park, on the Southwest by the Equestrian Center and the DeLong property and on the west by the Wallace property. The property is presently accessed from Platte Canyon Road via Hunters Run and there is a historical farm access to Fairway Lane.

With the exception of the River Corridor and Park, and the Equestrian Center, the surrounding property is primarily single family residential. To the east there is one undeveloped parcel (Wallace family) and one partially developed parcel (DeLong).

There are two large lots on the west side that are included in the preliminary plan and are part of the 105 acres but are not presently in the Town. It is the applicant's intention to annex these properties into the Town and the Annexation Petition will be submitted with the Final Development Plan.

II. Description of the Submittal Documents

The initial preliminary plan and plat presented at the June 14th P&Z hearing contained 105 lots and there were at least six revisions prepared prior to the October 25th P&Z meeting. These are described in the Parts I and II of the Full Staff Report. The revised plan that was presented to the Planning Commission has again been revised.

This revision includes a new Letter of Intent, a new Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat, Preliminary Landscape Plan and a preliminary Construction Management Plan all of which are attached.

A. The Preliminary Development Plan consists of five Sheets, as follows:

Sheet 1: The Title Sheet which contains the legal description, standard and special notes, certifications and signature blocks. Sheet 1 also contains the following Area Tabulations and Development Stipulations Chart:

AREA TABULATIONS

USE	AREA	% OF TOTAL
RIGHT OF WAY	8.92 ACRES	8.51%
OPEN SPACE/TRACTS	48.38 ACRES	46.15%
LOTTED AREA	47.53 ACRES	45.34%
TOTAL	104.83	100.00%

Development Stipulations Chart (11/10/16)

DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS	FILING 1	FILING 2
BUILDING HEIGHTS MAX	25' 0" FRONT ALONG FAIRWAY LANE. SINGLE STORY WALKOUTS ALLOWED	35'0" (LIMITED TO TWO STORIES)
MINIMUM LOT SIZE	20,000 Sq. Ft.	15,000 Sq.
SETBACKS	FILING #1	FILING # 2
FRONT (TO LIVING SPACE)	30'	25'
FRONT (SIDE LOADED GARAGES)	30'	25'
SIDE	15'	15'
SIDE TO STREET	15'	15'
REAR	40'	25'
REAR TO OPEN SPACE	40'	15'
MINIMUM DISTANCE BETEEN STRUCTURES	30'	30'
PARKING (OFF-STREET)	2 SPACES PER UNIT	
VISITOR PARKING	ON STREET	
SIGNAGE	NUMBERS AND DIMENSIONS	
PROJECT IDENTIFICATION	2 PROJECECT IDENTIFICATION SIGNS AT EACH GATEWAY. ONE AT THE END OF HUNTER RUN AND ONE AT THE ACCESS OFF FAIRWAY LANE.	
DIRECTIONAL, INFORMATIONAL, TEMPORARY	TO BE DETERMINED	
WALLS, FENCES, HEDGES	TYPE, MATERIALS & HEIGHT	
NORTH PROPERTY LINE	36" (to top rail) WOOD 3 RAIL FENCE ON OPEN SPACE TRACTS, OTHERWISE HOMES FRONT TO FAIRWAY LANE	
EAST, SOUTH AND WEST PROPERTY LINE	48" WOOD 3 RAIL FENCE	
EXTERIOR LIGHTING	HEIGHT AND FIXTURE TYPE SHOWN ON FINAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN	

Sheet 2: The development notes and design standards are contained on this sheet.

Sheets 3-4: These sheets show the Site Plan and contain lot configurations, road alignments, major access points and an emergency access. Also shown are lot size and open space tracts.

Sheet 5: This sheet illustrates the proposed Entry Monument (signs).

B. The Preliminary Plat consists of 6 sheets, as follows:

Sheet 1: The Title Sheet which contains the legal description, standard and special notes, signature blocks, Sheet 1 also contains the following Tract Summary Chart:

LAND USE SUMMARY CHART					
TRACT	AREA (SF)	AREA (AC)	USE	OWNER SHIP	MAINTENANCE
TRACT A	1,878,873	43.133	OPEN SPACE/DRAINAGE/ TRAILS	HOA	HOA
TRACT B	144,648	3.321	OPEN SPACE/DRAINAGE/ TRAILS	HOA	HOA
TRACT C	83,966	1.928	OPEN SPACE/DRAINAGE/ TRAILS	HOA	HOA
TOTAL TRACT AREA	2,107,487	48.381			
TOTAL LOT AREA	2,070,219	47.526			
TOTAL ROW AREA	388,620	8.921		TOWN	TOWN
TOTAL SITE AREA	4,566,326	104.828			

Sheet 2. The Plat which shows the lots, tracts, street dimensions and the name of the adjacent platted subdivisions.

Sheets 3-6: These sheets show the lots, tracts, easement with dimensions, square footage and survey data (angles, distances and bearings).

C. The Landscape Plan consists of 12 sheets.

The Cover Sheet which contains the General Construction Notes. Sheet 1 also includes a site map and an index of all the sheets.

Sheet LO.1: This sheet contains the Landscape Notes that specify landscape requirements. This sheet also contains graphic illustrations for the planting of trees and shrubs.

Sheets L1.0-L1.8: These sheets illustrate the proposed location and general type of plantings throughout the site

Sheet L 2.0 shows the proposed fencing detail and the Water Quality Section at the Cooley Lake Edge.

D. Architectural Exhibits

1. Architectural Illustrations: These are illustrations of the different models which are intended to show the types of residences that applicant is proposing. These illustrations do not contain floor plans or square footage.
2. Architectural Images: These are illustrations of homes built in other areas. These are not units proposed for Wild Plum Farm but are intended to illustrate the quality that CalAtlantic can build.

Also submitted were the Preliminary Construction Documents which are on file but not included in this report.

III. Traffic Impact Study

A Traffic Impact Study was prepared by the Town's Traffic Engineer. The study consists of two parts. Part I which is the analysis of exiting conditions was prepared in 2104 when the first Wild Plum Farm proposal was under discussion. The analysis concentrated on the existing traffic volumes on South Platte Road and the Town's internal streets.

The Phase II Traffic Impact Study which was prepared in May 2016 contains the estimated traffic volumes, directional distribution and turn movements, that would be generated by 105 residential units. The Phase II Traffic Study is included, in its entirety, as an appendix to the Part I full staff report. A summary of the study is found on pages 6-8 of the Part I report.

At the June 14th P&Z hearing there were a number of questions raised by the HOA's, residents and Planning Commissioners concerning traffic. The primary concerns were:

- The potential for traffic to "cut through" WPF via Hunter Run and Fairway to get to the Bowles/Middlefield intersection in order to avoid the Platte Canyon Road congestion.
- The possible conflict in the Town's internal streets due to the mix of automobile, bicycle, golf cart and pedestrian traffic.

These concerns were addressed in the staff presentation report at the August 23rd continued hearing. The detailed response can be found in the Part II Full Report (pdf version) pages 6-11. In summary the additional research and traffic counts found that:

- The primary purpose for "cut through" traffic is to save time during the morning and evening rush hours. The staff conducted a total of 25 "timed runs" to compare the time difference between the Hunter Run-Fairway lane "cut through" route and the Platte Canyon-Bowles-Middlefield Rd. route. The timed runs showed in almost all cases the Platte Canyon –Bowles –Middlefield Rd alternate took slightly less time.
- Despite concerns related to traffic mix on Town roadways, there is no history of "reported" crashes involving vehicles, golf carts or bicycles in the most recent 3 years of record. There was one recent accident involving a pedestrian.

- An extensive field data collection effort was undertaken which determined the frequency and severity of conflicts that currently occur on Town streets. In summary, those conflicts are minor (as expected given the lack of crash history) and the increase in volume due to Wild Plum is not anticipated to create any new problems. However, potential options to minimize conflicts were presented for consideration.

A. Revised Traffic Study

The Town Traffic Engineer has prepared an analysis of the traffic impact of the 95 units proposed in the latest plan. The updated analysis is attached and is summarized below:

It is estimated that the Wild Plum Farm project, at build out, would generate an average daily traffic of 1000 trips per day. Approximately 20% of the total daily trips would occur in the AM and PM peak hours.

TABLE 1

ADT (Average Daily Trips)			
Scenario	Platte Canyon Rd	Hunter Run	Fairway Lane
Existing	18,000	230	1,660
Existing w/Project	18,500	1,000	1,890
Future (2034)	19,080	230	1,660
Future w/Project	19,540	1,000	1,890

Table 2
AM/PM PEAK HOUR
VPH (Vehicles per Hour)

	Platte Canyon Rd. at Hunter Run	Platte Canyon Rd. at Fairway Ln.	Fairway Lane at Driver	Fairway Lane at Club Lane
Existing	1090/1210	1560/1630	60/60	100/95
Projected with WPF	1140/1270	1600/1690	85/85	120/125
Projected 2030	1210/	1700/	85/85	120/125

The study includes an analysis of the Level of Service (LOS) of the adjacent arterial and interior streets. LOS measures the quality of traffic flow and the ratings for the AM/PM peak hour. The reduction from 105 to 95 units does not change the Level of Service ratings for any streets or intersections.

**TABLE 3
LEVEL OF SERVICE
PLATTE CANYON RD. INTERSECTIONS**

Scenario	W. Bowles Ave.	Village Ct.	Fairway Ln.	Coal Mine Ave	Hunter Run	Mineral Ave.
Existing	E/E	E/F	B/A	F/D	C/B	D/C
Existing w/Project	E/E	E/F	B/A	F/D	C/D	D/C
Future (Year 2034)	E/D	F/F	B/B	D/D	C/B	D/C
Future w/Project	F/D	F/F	C/B	D/D	D/E	D/C

**TABLE 4
LEVEL OF SERVICE
TOWN INTERSECTIONS**

Scenario	W. Bowles Ave. at Middlefield.	Fairway Ln. at Club Ln.	Fairway Ln. at Driver Ln.	Fairway Ln. at Wedge Ln.
Existing	B/B	A/A	A/A	A/A
Existing w/Project	B/B	A/A	A/A	A/A
Future (Year 2034)	B/B	A/A	A/A	A/A
Future w/Project	B/B	A/A	A/A	A/A

B. Conclusions

1. Ninety five (95) residential dwelling units would generate approximately 1,000 vehicle trips per day, including approximately 76 and 100 trips during the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively.
2. The characteristics of Hunter Run Ln make it an appropriate access to Wild Plum: it is an underutilized access to Platte Canyon Rd; it functions as a collector roadway with few properties that directly access the roadway; and its proximity to Platte Canyon Rd minimizes out of direction travel and related impacts on neighboring properties. Fairway Lane and Middlefield Rd, other collector roadways in the Town, provide secondary access to the site as well as primary access for traffic to/from the east on Bowles Ave.
3. As a state highway, Platte Canyon Rd is under the jurisdiction of the Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT). Wild Plum will increase the volume of traffic accessing the highway at Hunter Run Ln by more than 20%, therefore a State Highway Access Permit will be necessary.

Traffic at the Fairway Lane access to Platte Canyon Rd will also increase; however, the magnitude of the increase is less than the 20% requiring a state highway access permit.

4. The intersection of Platte Canyon Rd and Hunter Run Lane warrants a southbound left turn deceleration lane upon development of Wild Plum. The existing southbound left turn lane does not meet current CDOT standards for a roadway with a NR-A access category. Platte Canyon Rd could be restriped to provide a longer deceleration lane; however this would impact the northbound left-turn lane for Coal Mine Rd which is a much more critical movement to overall traffic flow through the corridor. The study has concluded that vehicle queues for the southbound left turn movement will typically be one car length or less. For these reasons, no changes to existing left turn striping along Platte Canyon Rd is recommended.
5. Although the 15 northbound right turns per hour projected for Hunter Run Ln is less than the 26 needed to warrant a right-turn deceleration lane, it is recommended that construction of a right-turn lane be considered for safety purposes. In any event, improvements to the intersection of Platte Canyon Rd and Hunter Run Ln will be required to improve entering sight distance for Hunter Run Ln.

The study concludes that the potential traffic impacts of the Wild Plum development can be addressed by the transportation improvements outlined in this report

IV. Report of the Town Engineer

November 28, 2016

RE: Wild Plum

Mr. Sieber:

ICON Engineering has completed a review of recent submittals related to the proposed Wild Plum development. There are a few key issues that will need additional coordination and we believe can be satisfactorily resolved in subsequent discussions and revisions to the Construction Documents.

1. **Stormwater.** It is our understanding that the Applicant is proposing no on-site stormwater detention facility and only intends on providing water quality treatment for the project site. An official request for variance has not been submitted. The rationalization for considering no detention is that the site is a small sub-basin at the downstream limit of a much larger drainage basin area. Sometimes referred to as “beat the peak” approach, the idea is to allow the site to discharge stormwater ahead of peak flows from the overall basin. There could be potential for less impact on the downstream system, the South Platte River. Calculations to verify that this approach can provide benefit at the Wild Plum location have not been submitted.

The proposal for no stormwater detention has been discussed with the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (UDFCD) and South Suburban Park and Recreation District (SSPRD). UDFCD neither supports or opposes this approach and indicated that it is a decision for the local jurisdiction. SSPRD did not voice any concerns with this option. A discussion with the City of Littleton, an adjacent landowner, 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 Wild Plum submittal shows trail and earthwork (excavation) in these easements. Analyses to show no floodplain impacts and USACE concurrence with proposed changes are needed.

3. **Hunter Run Ln.** The existing ROW at Hunter Run Ln is generally 60-ft wide. The proposed Hunter Run Ln ROW width at Wild Plum will need to be increased from 50-ft to 60-ft (Minor Collector)

for consistency. The proposed typical road section pavement width of 42-ft is acceptable for the Hunter Run Ln extension.

The existing Hunter Run Ln roadway, between South Platte Canyon Rd and Wild Plum, includes a 5-ft wide landscaped median and narrow (10-ft) driving lanes on each side. The Applicant proposes protection of the existing median throughout construction. There are several circumstances that could change the median, landscaping, and roadway widths along Hunter Run. Tree or curb damage during construction, need for additional golf cart path width, and roadway improvements could lead to changes in roadway width up to and including removal of part of or the entire median.

With the existing narrow roadway lane width at Hunter Run Ln, there is a safety concern for pedestrians and golf carts that will navigate between Polo Meadows HOA and Wild Plum or the Columbine Country Club. A trail connection between Polo Meadows and Wild Plum, modified Hunter Run Ln road section, or other considerations should be evaluated during final design.

At the intersection of Hunter Run Ln and South Platte Canyon Rd, CDOT has requested modifications including turning lane and deceleration lane changes for South Platte Canyon Rd. Lane widths and locations may need to be modified during final design.

4. **Adjacent Property Access.** The Wild Plum project will need to provide access to adjacent unincorporated properties at the northwest corner of the site. The proposed 30-ft wide access easement will need to be changed to 50-ft ROW width (Local) for future access improvements by others.
5. **Nevada Ditch.** Coordination with Denver Water and Nevada Ditch will be required to establish easements for the Hunter Run Ln and adjacent property access crossings. The design and plat information also needs to confirm the physical ditch alignment and easement for the ditch.
6. **Environmental.** The Applicant has submitted a General Ecological Resources Survey. At the time of the survey, no threatened or endangered species or their habitat were identified at the site. Compliance with the Migratory Bird Species Act will be necessary during construction to avoid preventable bird deaths.

Waters of the U.S./wetlands were identified at Nevada Ditch, Brown Ditch, overflow drainage near Cooley late and areas near the South Platte River. No formal delineation has been completed to define jurisdictional wetland limits. It is anticipated that 404 Permitting will be required for construction.

An investigation to identify potential historical properties, such as the Nevada Ditch or Brown Ditch, will need to be completed for compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act.

7. **Trail.** The proposed trail, particularly in areas on USACE easements and in floodplain, will require realignment during final design. The trail is currently shown through areas that exist today as debris piles, manure stock piles, small ponds and potential wetlands. Updated plans should align the trail with natural contours and features of the land.
8. **Construction Management.** The Applicant has submitted a draft construction management plan. During final design, the plan will need updates to include the following:
 - Modified working hours
 - Construction noise control
 - Nesting bird and wetland protection
 - Protection and/or replacement of Hunter Run Ln median and mature landscaping
 - Access point requirements for house construction (Fairway Ln vs. Hunter Run Ln)
9. The Ecological Resources Survey will need to further address delineation of jurisdictional wetlands and potential for historical properties. Applicant's communication with the USACE and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should be initiated soon.

We look forward to continued coordination with the applicant and their engineers.

V. Comments of the Referral Agencies

The original development proposal was referred to 22 outside agencies and all the Town's HOA's.

A. OUTSIDE AGENCIES

The following agencies received referrals:

CDOT	Xcel Energy	Platte Canyon Water and Sanitation
South Platte Park	Arapahoe County – Planning	
South Suburban Parks and Rec		Army Corps of Engineers
	Arapahoe County Engineering	Littleton Fire District
Littleton Schools		Nevada Ditch Co.
Denver Water	Urban Drainage	DRCOG
Century Link		Comcast
City of Littleton		

Engineering	Colorado Water Conservation Board	Tri-County Health
City of Littleton – Planning	Colorado Geologic Survey	Colorado Division of Wildlife

Responses were received from Arapahoe County Engineering, 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. Urban Drainage and CDOT The complete responses are included in the full formal report and summarized in Section VII (Findings) of this report.

B. HOA'S

Responses were received from the following HOA's:

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

The HOA responses are included verbatim in appendixes to the full formal staff report and are summarized in the Findings section of this report.

C. Resident Responses

We received numerous emails from Town residents which are included verbatim in the full staff reports. Their concerns and the staff response are summarized in the Findings section of this report.

D. Referrals and Responses to the "95 Unit" Plan

The revised 95 Unit Plan that was presented to the Planning Commission on October 25th was received by the staff in November and was referred to the Littleton Fire District, Littleton Scholl District and all the HOA's. Responses have been received from the Fire District, School District.

Littleton Fire District: We are fine with the both emergency access location. An access on Street B would be more convenient.

Littleton Public Schools: The Transportation Services Center would like to see that the emergency access road off Street B of Sheet 3 Site Plan for the Wild Plum Planned Development proposal be allowed for school bus travel. We would hope this emergency access would be maintained and kept plowed during inclement weather so LPS school buses could access this.

Scott French
Transportation Services Center

As of November 29th there have been no responses from any of the HOA's.

VI. Findings

The staff reviewed the plans and supporting documents and the referral comments received prior to, and at, the June 14th P&Z hearing. Additional responses and comments were received prior to and after the August 23rd continued hearing. Those responses were included in the Full Staff Report. The staff also made several site visits and met with the applicant numerous times. We had telephone calls from residents with questions about the proposed development. Based on this review and communications, we offered findings and made a recommendation at the August 23rd continued hearing.

The following findings relate to the 95 Unit plan that was presented to the Planning Commission on October 25th and was the subject of their recommendation to the Trustees

A. Compliance with the Land Use Regulations

A new application was not submitted with any of the revisions after June 14th. The original Application for Land Development contained all the required documents, and in general, did comply with the provisions of the Land Use Regulations. There were errors and omissions that have been noted but these did not involve substantive issues. The corrections and revisions were noted in the Long Letter which was attached to the full report.

B. Consistency with the Master Plan

The Town of Columbine Valley Master Plan has established a Town Vision and a set of Goals for Land Development. The vision statement and 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 lists the relevant

vision and goals of the Master Plan and the staff evaluation (in green font) of how the most recent Wild Plum Farm 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 reserve approximately 45% of the site as common open space with an extensive trail system and adequate area for passive recreation.
- 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.
The preliminary plan shows partial access to two public streets, Fairway Lane and Hunters Run. As revised there would be 22 units that would access Fairway Lane and 73 units would utilize the Hunter Run access. It is the staff opinion that the partial connection is not consistent with this vision statement.

The Town Traffic Engineer's November revision of the Phase II Traffic Study projects the LOS (level of Service) on Fairway Lane is presently A and the additional traffic 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 with the project traffic.

- 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 April 29 -30 digital copies of the following documents were emailed to all the active HOA's:

**Applicant's Letter of Intent
The Preliminary Development Plan
The (2014) Phase 1 Traffic Study
The Architectural Illustrations**

On May 10th the same documents were posted on the Town' Web Site. Subsequently, the Phase II Traffic Study was sent to the HOA's

There have been a number of meetings that involved residents of the community:

On April 16th and 17th 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 24th 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 26th the Town Administrator and Town Planner met with members of the Polo Meadows HOA Board and on May 31st 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.

Since June 7th there have been informal meetings with HOA representatives.

Between May 1 and November 24th the staff received numerous emails and telephone calls from residents.

- 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 applicant has meet with Town staff on numerous occasions and the land owner was present at some of those meetings.

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 95 single family residential units, a density of less than 1.0 DU's per acre.

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

The table below illustrates the density and lot sizes of WPF and the adjacent existing residential development.

Table 5

Development/# of Lots	Wild Plum Farm 95	Old Town 178	Polo Meadows 18	Burning Tree 122
Density DU's Acre	.90	1.67	1.26	2.4
Min. Lot Size(S.F.)	15,000	15,000	19,900	10,000
Largest Lot Size	38,337	47,700	32,600	29,300
Average Lot Size	21,792	20,800	22,500	14,521
% Common Open Space	46.15%	Virtually 0%	10% (Est)	17%

The lot sizes proposed for WPF are slightly larger than Old Town, smaller than Polo Meadows and larger than those in Burning Tree.

- 3 Insure that new streets are built as wide, two lane roads with generous rooms for pedestrians, bicycles and golf carts 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), which 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 meet the goal of promoting 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 Department of Natural Resources, Division of Wildlife and their response is included in page 11 of the Part I Full Report. The applicant has prepared an Ecological Resources Study that includes an inventory of the wildlife on the WPF property. The report needs additional analysis and must be submitted to the Division of Wildlife for their review.

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 6

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 costs 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 plan proposes two points of access, one via Hunter Run and access for 22 homes to Fairway Lane. This does not provide most of the WPF residents with an optional vehicular access to the Club and other areas of the Town. The Plan also proposes a system of trails within the site that would be available to other residents of the Town.

C. Traffic Impact

In Section III of this report, Table 1 illustrated the total daily and peak hour vehicle trips that (1) currently use the Town's streets and adjacent arterials, (2) the trips that would be generated by the WPF project and (3) the total trips at project build out. Table 2 illustrates the current LOS (Level of Service) rating for the streets and the LOS for those same streets with the WPF build out. The Town internal streets (Middlefield Road, Club Lane and Fairway Lane) are currently rated at a LOS A/A (AM/PM) and this rating would not change with the project traffic. Hunter Run, which is currently rated C/B would change to an LOS **C/D** with the recommended improvements.

The increase in daily and peak hour traffic on the Town's internal streets is considered acceptable in that the impacts would not significantly affect the safety or the travel time of the Town residents. This is based on national standards and it does not necessarily reflect the views of the current residents in the area.

The 95 Unit plan submitted for the Trustees review does not provide the continuity as recommended by staff. The plan does show an emergency access at the east end of Street A where it would connect to Street B. This emergency access, if properly dimensioned, would meet with the recommendations of the Fire District. The School District would prefer an additional or alternate location for the emergency access

D. Comments of the HOA's and Residents

Beginning with the submittal of the original application 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 are included verbatim in appendixes to Parts II and II of the Full Report. The major points expressed in the appendixes are summarized below followed the staff response in **green font**:

1. Method of Calculating Density. Wild Plum Farm is not truly a 1.0 DU's per Acre density because of the amount of undevelopable land.

Both the Master Plan and the Town Land Use Regulations specify that density is calculated on the gross site area and not on the amount of developable land. This was not an oversight. A review of the minutes of the Planning Commission meetings on the Master Plan indicates the members were fully aware that the Tuck property had significant areas of undevelopable land. The gross site area method of calculating density has been applied to every development in Columbine Valley since 1997.

2. Access
 - a. Access onto Fairway Lane should be limited to the 11 lots in Filing #1. The remainder of the WPF lots should have full vehicular access to Hunter Run only. Emergency access and pedestrian, bicycle and cart access to Fairway Lane would be allowed. This is a central issue in the response from Old Town.
 - b. Requiring all traffic to access the site via Hunter Run places an undue burden on the residents of Polo Meadows and portions of Burning Tree and would not be an equitable distribution of traffic.

The staff response to this issue has been stated in the Findings, Section VII B under "Town Vision".

3. Compatibility with development in surrounding neighborhoods.
Table 5 illustrates that the development standards are comparable to those in adjacent neighborhoods.
4. Quality of the proposed development. There were numerous comments expressing concern about the design characteristics of the proposed homes to be built and whether they reflected the quality that exists in the Town. This was based on the architectural illustrations submitted with the application and included in the referrals to the HOA's. After the June 14th P&Z hearing revised illustrations were submitted to the HOAs.

Please see the following findings subsection for the staff response.

E. Architectural Design

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

*“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. These are an improvement over the illustrations that were originally submitted. However they are “proposed” and indicate what the builder can build. The applicant has also submitted illustrations of homes built in other areas. These do not reflect what is proposed to be built on WPF but is intended to illustrate the quality of design the applicant is capable of.

The applicant has met the minimum requirements for consideration at time of Preliminary Plan approval. Neither she staff nor the Planning Commission has recommended approval of the proposed design. The staff proposes to engage the services of a design consultant and will coordinate with the applicant to develop new design standards for Wild Plum Farm.

In summary the staff finds that the Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Plat are:

- A. Are essentially in compliance with the Town’s Land Use Regulations.
- B. Are not consistent with the Master Plan Vision Statement in that full connectivity to the Town street system is not provided.
- C. The traffic from the proposed development will increase the volumes on the Town’s existing street system but that is can be accommodated without a decrease in the Level of Service rating.

- D. The architectural design standards for Wild Plum Farm need major revisions in order to insure the quality of development that would be acceptable. This can be accomplished as part of the Final Development Plan process.

VI Concerns

The staff and Planning Commission review, and the response of the area residents, concerning the proposed development of Wild plum Farm has been complex and controversial. From the beginning, the predominant major issues are access to Fairway Lane and the quality of the architectural design. The result has been that other issues have not received the degree of attention that we would normally expect. These concerns are:

- A. The cross section proposed for Hunter Run needs further discussion. There is concern over the ability to separate auto and golf cart traffic on the section east of the Polo Meadows entrance. Further consultation with the Polo Meadows and affected Burning Tree residents will be necessary.
- B. The scope of the required improvements at the intersection of Hunter Run Lane and Platte Canyon Road are still to be determined. The traffic signal warrant study completed for this intersection determined that Wild Plum will not generate enough traffic to warrant installation of a traffic signal. As part of the access permit process, CDOT will determine the nature of the required improvements at the intersection. The costs for these improvements will be the responsibility of the Applicant. Town staff recommends installation of a northbound right-turn lane; provision for separate left- and right-turn lanes exiting Hunter Run to Platte Canyon Road; and improvements to mitigate currently inadequate sight distance. The Applicant has provided an intersection concept that generally meets staff's intent for the intersection improvement; however, additional refinements will be necessary before an access permit application can be made to CDOT.
- C. As part of the required improvements at the intersection of Hunter Run Lane and Platte Canyon Road, staff recommends that some provision for pedestrians crossing from Wild Plum / Polo Meadows to the SSPRD trail west of Platte Canyon Road be provided. Further discussions with the Applicant and CDOT will be required on this issue.
- D. The Construction Management Plan needs more specific information concerning:
- Modified working hours
 - Construction noise control
 - Nesting bird and wetland protection

- Protection and/or replacement of Hunter Run Ln median and mature landscaping
- Access point requirements for house construction (Fairway Ln vs. Hunter Run Ln). The construction access for the 11 homes on Fairway Lane is yet to be determined. If access to these lots is to be via Hunter's Run the plan will need to identify truck turn-around locations and other logistical considerations.
- Temporary cameras will be placed, at the Developers expense, to monitor construction traffic. Violations will be assessed on a weekly basis and fines levied for violations.

VII. Planning Commission Action

At their continued hearing on October 25th, the Planning and Zoning Commission heard the revised (95 units) preliminary Development Plan. Because there had been no submittal of this plan to the staff, there was no staff report. The staff responded to questions from P&Z members. Since the public portion of the hearing had been closed there was no comment from the HOA's or residents.

After discussion the Planning Commission voted to recommend approval of the revised Preliminary Development Plan with the following conditions:

- A. A total/maximum of 95 homes.**
- B. An average lot size of ½ acre.**
- C. A minimum lot size of 15,000 sq. ft.**
- D. 11 custom home lots on Fairway Lane (Filing 1) and 11 additional lots in Filing 2 on a cul-de-sac accessing Fairway Lane.**
- E. Setbacks/distance between homes per Revision 4 stipulations, August 23, 2016 Staff Report Table 1.**
- F. Money put in escrow for a future traffic light at Platte Canyon and Hunter Run.**
- G. Brick wall on north side of Hunter Run as requested by individual property owners.**
- H. Maximum 25' building height in Filing 1.**
- I. Maximum 35' building height in Filing 2.**
- J. The architectural design standards for Filing 1 must comply with the Design Standards of the Old Town Homeowners Association.**
- K. All homes must face the street.**
- L. Prior to the Board of Trustees meeting:**
 - 1. The Town staff will conduct a signal warrant study for the intersection of Platte Canyon Road and Hunter Run,**
 - 2. The staff and Applicant in conjunction with the affected HOA's will develop a preliminary Construction Management Plan,**
 - 3. The applicant will provide a written response to the Town Engineers comments and recommendations.**

VIII. Recommendations

Based on the findings in Section VI and the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission the staff offers the following recommendations:

- A. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the 95 Unit Plan with conditions. That plan does not show a full connection to Fairway Lane. It has been and still is the staff recommendation that a full connection be shown on the Plan. However the staff is aware of concern a large number of residents have with the full connection and the Board of Trustees may not agree with this particular staff recommendation. In that event the staff would recommend that on the Final Development Plan) all emergency accesses:
 - 1. Be clearly called out with R-O-W and travel surface dimensioned.
 - 2. The R-O-W and area designated as the emergency access location
Be shown as a separate Tract owned by the Town and maintained by the HOA.
 - 3. The type of gate or barrier and the gate or barrier control be determined at time of Final Development Plan review after further consultation with the Fire District and School District
- B. All the conditions recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission.
- C. Agree to revise the Construction Management Plan as suggested by the staff.
- D. Immediately following action on the Preliminary Plan, the applicant will update the Ecological Resources Study as recommended by the Town Engineer and submit to the Division of Wildlife.
- E. Revise the proposed cross section of Hunter Run as recommended by the Town Engineer.
- F. Make the other revisions recommended in the Town Engineers Report.
- G. Prior to the submittal of the Final Development Plan the applicant will meet with the Town staff and their design consultant and develop new architectural design standards. Except for the general development stipulations on Sheet 2 of the preliminary plan, all other design standards shall be deleted and a note added stating:

To Be Determined on the Final Development Plan

APPENDIX B Referral Comments

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

Here is the Fire Dept's response. They are fine with any sort of gated option provided they have 24/7/365 access. They do not care whether the access is used by buses or snow plow drivers.

rom: Timothy Stover [<mailto:tstover@littletongov.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 16, 2016 4:04 PM
To: Matthew Brown <Matt@Stolfusandassociates.com>
Cc: Doug Ireland <direland@littletongov.org>
Subject: Re: FW: Emergency vehicle access for Wild Plum in Columbine Valley

Hi Matt,

I am OK with either option. The alternate location will provide us with a quicker response to the southwest portion if we have a vehicle coming from Fairway Lane. In either location the emergency access will need to meet the road requirements for access, width, weight limits and turning radius. It is also important to keep in mind that anytime you have **more than** 30 homes on one dead end road, it will require a second access point.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions. Tim Stover
Division Chief/Fire Marshal
Littleton Fire Rescue
2255 W Berry Ave.
Littleton, CO 80120
303-795-3862
littletongov.org



Transportation Services Center, 5565 S. Crocker Street, Littleton, CO 80120

November 18, 2016

To : Phil Sieber, Town Planner
From: Scott French, Transportation Director
Regarding: Development Proposal For Wild Plum

Hi Phil,

Thank you for allowing us to comment on how the school buses could travel in the Wild Plum development proposal area.

In review of drawings; Sheet 3 Site Plan North and Sheet 4 Site Plan South it appears that for the three LPS school buses (Heritage H.S., Goddard M.S. and Wilder E.S) to gain access to this development the buses would have two pick-up and drop off locations for students to meet the buses. These stops could be as follows;

1. Bus stop 1 would be near the South access point in drawing Sheet 3
2. Bus stop 2 would be Near the North access point off of Fairway Lane.

We were hopeful the North site proposal would show one cul-de-sac and one central through road so buses could enter and exit utilizing the two access points in Sheet 3 Site Plan North.

Would there be pedestrian walk paths that might interconnected these three cul-de-sacs to one another? This could help minimize the need for all three buses to make two

bus stops each morning and afternoon as indicated above and just make one central stop location for students? Without actual distances plotted on these drawings it is hard to determine a reasonable walk for students to meet the school buses.

Please feel free to contact me either Monday or Tuesday next week.

Thank you,

Scott French

School District Received November 21

Hi Mr. Sieber,

LPS transportation department would like to see that the emergency access road off Street B of Sheet 3 Site Plan for the Wild Plum Planned Development proposal be allowed for school bus travel. We would hope this emergency access would be maintained and kept plowed during inclement weather so LPS school buses could access this.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Scott French
Transportation Services Center

HOA's

No responses received as of November 29th

Residents

These are the only comments received from residents after October 25th.

From: Craig Myles [<mailto:cemyles@icloud.com>]
Sent: Friday, November 11, 2016 9:45 AM
To: Board of Trustees; JD McCrumb
Cc: cemyles@icloud.com

Subject: Wild Plum Farm development

> Dear Mayor Champion and Board of Trustees:

>

> As a homeowner in the Town of Columbine (2 Driver Lane), I wanted to provide you with my thoughts on the proposed Wild Plum Farm development. First I would like to state that I am not opposed to the development of this parcel, here are my concerns:

>

> 1. Flood Plain- The proposed development is for an approximate 100 acre parcel. Of that parcel, approximately 30 acres are in a flood plain. Therefore, the developable area is no more than 70 acres. The 70 acres should be the basis by which the number of units is determined.

>

> 2. Density- The number of units per acre pursuant to the Master Plan should be compatible with the surrounding neighborhoods. As the site is adjacent to two low density subdivisions outside our Town and is adjacent to other developments (Burning Tree and the Polo developments) that are on the lower scale of medium density developments within our community, it is my opinion that this development should maintained as low (<1 unit per acre) density.

>

> 3. Congestion- The Wild Plum development should enhance the value of our community and not impact it adversely. A higher density development deep within the community will adversely impact the low levels of traffic and already limited space for pedestrians, bikes and golf carts. As you are aware, medium to high density developments typically are closer to arterial streets and access, this parcel does not provide those characteristics.

>

> 4. Nature- Part of the appeal of Columbine Valley is the closeness the community provides to wetlands, undeveloped habitat and wildlife areas. Providing open space and parks not only invites our community to interact with nature but is part of the reason this Town is so unique. I believe that the undevelopable portion of this parcel (the 30 acres) should remain undeveloped or be granted as a conservation easement.

>

> As Mayor and Town Trustees you have the authority to plan for and regulate the use of land within our community. The Wild Plum parcel is your last "at bat" in terms of undeveloped land within our community, I hope you take this opportunity to listen to the concerns of the existing homeowners and understand there is no appropriate time for a development that does not showcase Columbine in a positive manner.

>

> Thank you for your consideration.

>

> Best regards,

> Craig Myles

> 303-570-9641 cell

>



November 18 AbdoCR.msg

Nov 20, 2016

First of all, thank you both for working on behalf of Old Town and working to create smart development within our small town. It seems we need to be cognizant of not creating high density housing in the already busy area of Platte Canyon and Bowles.

I attended the last board meeting at Hudson Gardens and a recurring theme was multiple access points. One board member at the last meeting indicated that they didn't want to continue making the same mistakes as the past in allowing for only one access point. Since there is already one neighborhood that has only one access point, it makes sense to connect these two together! It solves many problems. Both the Tuck Farm Property and Burning Tree currently have only one access point. Burning Tree needs an additional access point and the Tuck Farm needs a traffic light. Seems like a marriage made in heaven!!

The board made a wise decision in choosing not to allow traffic flow through the Old Town neighborhood. As another board member said, even if it's not meant to be a pass through, he would use it that way as would EVERYONE else! A golf cart, bike and pedestrian friendly community is not equipped to deal with the increased traffic of 95 homes plus the Polo neighborhood Homes and increased traffic with a new clubhouse. Thank you so much for supporting safety in Old Town. Well done!!

Debbie McGough
(No Address)