

REZONING AND PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN, PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL, WILDER, LANE, PLATTE CANYON PARTNERS, LLC, APPLICANT.

I. Purpose and Location

This is a request for Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), and Preliminary Plat approval for twenty-four (24) single family lots (patio homes) on a 6.62 acre site. The property contains two contiguous parcels, one located on Platte Canyon Road approximately 1/8 mile south of West Bowles Ave, and one located at 6051 So. Middlefield Road. The west parcel (4.33 acres), owned by Nelson Real Estate Properties, Inc., and under contract to the applicant, is zoned MU (Mixed Use). The east parcel, (2.29 acres), formerly owned by Esther Jurgelonis, is zoned A (Agriculture). It is proposed to rezone both parcels to Residential Planned Development (RPD). The site is bounded on the north by Platte Canyon Square commercial development, on the east by Country Club Villas, on the west by Platte Canyon Road, and on the south by the Village in Columbine Valley.

This application was heard by the Planning and Zoning Commission on September 9, 2014 and recommended favorably with conditions. Those conditions are contained in Section X of this report.

II. Plan and Plat Description

A. Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) is attached and consists of seven sheets

Sheet 1: Contains the cover sheet and includes the title, legal description, standard and special notes, certifications and signature blocks, the applicant's project team and a vicinity map. Sheet 1 also includes the development stipulations chart which follows:

DEVELOPMENT STIPULATIONS CHART

Land Use Tabulation		
Land Use:	Single Family Residential	
Maximum Allowable Units:	24	
Maximum Allowable Density:	4.0 DU/Acre	
Zoning Designation:	PDR	
Existing Zoning	MU and AG	
Area Tabulation		
Use	Area	% of Total
Rights of Way	1.149 Acres	17.36%
Open Space/Tracts	0.954 Acre	14.42%
Lotted Area	4.514 Acres	68.22%
Total	6.617 Acres	100.00%

Development Stipulations	
ACREAGE	6.67 acres
DENSITY	3.63 DU/AC
BUILDING COVERAGE	45%
OPEN SPACE-PUBLIC, COMMON, YARDS	38.5%
Building Height Maximum	
Building Height Maximum (2 Story) – Lots 7-10	
One Story (1)	30' 0"
Two Story (2)	35'-0"
Setbacks	
South Platte Canyon Road ROW Front	25'-0"
Wilder Lane ROW to Residence	10' 0"
Wilder Lane ROW to Garage Facing Street	20' 0"
Side	5' 0"
Rear	10'-0"
Parking	
Off Street	96(4 per Lot)
Signage	Number and Dimensions
Project Identification	TBD
Tenant Identification (Ground Mounted)	N/A
Tenant Identification (Building Fascia)	N/A
Temporary	TBD
Walls, Fences, Hedges	Type, Materials, Height
North Property Line	Town Wall, Wood, Artificial Wood, or Existing CCV Wall
East Property Line	Landscaped Buffer
South Property Line	Wood or Artificial Wood
West Property Line	Town Wall & Wrought Iron
Exterior Lighting	See Narrative

(TBD) To be determined

(CCV) Country Club Villas

- (1) Lots 1-6 and 11-24
- (2) 7-10
- (3) Other than at Town Wall, Fences only occur at residence lot lines, not entire perimeter

- Sheet 2:** Shows the site plan including perimeter boundaries, lot layout, access points, road alignment, street cross section, and easements throughout the site.
- Sheet 3:** Is the preliminary utility plan which shows waterline, sanitary sewer lines, stormwater pipe locations, and ditch culverts.
- Sheet 4:** Shows the preliminary grading plan including proposed elevations, floodplain boundaries, inlet and outlet structures, and water quality ponds.
- Sheet 5:** Is the preliminary landscape plan for the west parcels and illustrates the common open space tracts, typical tree locations, perimeter fence locations with proposed types and materials, and Town standard wall along Platte Canyon Road and the commercial property.
- Sheet 6:** Is the preliminary landscape plan for the east parcels and illustrates the common open space tracts, typical tree locations, and perimeter fence locations with proposed types and materials.
- Sheet 7:** Shows precedent pictures of what the homes in the proposed development could look like.

Also included with the submittal were an application form, letter of intent, list of abutting properties, title work, Phase I Drainage Study and the Geotechnical Report.

B. The Preliminary Plat consists of 3 Sheets

Sheet 1: Contains the title, vicinity map, legal description, boundary closure report, standard and special notes, and signature blocks and certifications. Sheet 1 also includes the Tract Summary Chart.

TRACT SUMMARY CHART					
TRACT	AREA (SF)	AREA (AC)	USE	OWNERSHIP	MAINTENANCE
TRACT A	4,875	0.112	OPEN SPACE/DRAINAGE/TRAILS	HOA	HOA
TRACT B	3,790	0.087	OPEN SPACE/DRAINAGE/TRAILS	HOA	HOA
TRACT C	1,464	0.034	OPEN SPACE/DRAINAGE/TRAILS	HOA	HOA
TRACT D	17,989	0.0413	OPEN SPACE/DRAINAGE/TRAILS	HOA	HOA
TRACT E	2,731	0.063	OPEN SPACE/DRAINAGE/TRAILS	HOA*	HOA*
			RESERVATION OR DEDICATION*		
TRACT F	3,444	0.079	OPEN SPACE/DRAINAGE/TRAILS/ROW		
			RESERVATION OR DEDICATION*		
TRACT G	1,257	0.029	OPEN SPACE	HOA	HOA
TRACT H	3,102	0.071	OPEN SPACE/DRAINAGE	HOA	HOA
TRACT I	1,473	0.034	OPEN SPACE/DRAINAGE	HOA	HOA
TRACT J	1,417	0.033	OPEN SPACE/DRAINAGE	HOA	HOA
TOTAL TRACT AREA	41,541	0.954			
TOTAL LOT AREA	196,635	4.514			
TOTAL ROW AREA	50,057	1.149		CITY	CITY
TOTAL SITE AREA	288,233	6.617			

This subdivision plat contains 24 lots, 10 tracts and 1 road.

*To be determined at final plat.

Sheet 2: Is the plat map and shows the perimeter boundary, lots and tracts with dimensions, easements with dimensions and purpose, and record information on adjacent property owners.

Sheet 3: Shows the existing topography and existing site characteristics including existing vegetation.

III. Character of Adjacent Property

The site is bordered on the north by a commercial shopping center, on the east by single family residential (Country Club Villas), on the south by single family residential (The Village in Columbine Valley). East of the site, across Middlefield Road, is the Town Hall and Willowcroft Manor, a single family development under construction. The area to the west of the site, across Platte Canyon Road,

is a mixture of vacant land and developed single family residential in unincorporated Arapahoe County.

IV. Comment of Referral Agencies

The PDP Plan with relevant supporting documents was sent to the following agencies:

Urban Drainage & Flood Control District, Colorado Department of Transportation, Arapahoe County, City of Littleton, Littleton Fire District, Littleton Public School District, Denver Water, Platte Canyon Water and Sanitation District, South Suburban Park and Recreation, Arapahoe Library District, Century Link, Xcel Energy and the HOA's for Country Club Villas, The Village in Columbine Valley, Brookhaven Estates, Villa Avignon and the developer of Willowcroft Manor. A Development Status Bulletin was also posted on the Town Web Site.

Comments received to date are:

Colorado Department of Transportation

Thank you for referring the above noted preliminary construction plans for our review. The Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT, the Department) has reviewed the plans and we the following comments:

Utilities

To obtain permission to construct utilities, landscaping or any activities within state highway right-of-way, a Utility/Special Use Permit is required. Please visit our website at <http://www.dot.state.co.us/UtilityProgram/Process.cfm>, or obtain the application through this office.

Traffic

1. The plans are noted to be preliminary. Please ensure the construction plan for Platte Canyon is called out within the plan set and place the access permit number on the plan.
2. When the striping plan is prepared the acceleration lane from Wilder Lane must continue and tie into the exiting striping to the north.
3. Please provide pavement cross-sections (50-ft. minimum) for Platte Canyon.
4. The turn lanes must be 12 feet wide. In addition, curb and gutter needs to be constructed along the property frontage to tie into the curb to the north.
5. The plans call for a crusher fines walk. We recommend the trail be constructed as concrete to match the concrete walk to the north.
6. Please verify sight distance is being met looking south from the access.
7. An overhead light at the access will be required.
8. A CDOT handicap ramp standard with details on the plans will be required at the access when the walk is constructed as concrete.
9. If an overlay is required, the mill and overlay must be performed to within 6 to 12 inches of lane lines. The requirement is to avoid a cut line in a wheel travel path.

10. The access permit was previously issued for a full movement access. I will need the access permit to be resubmitted for revision to a right in right out
11. Tracts E and F show for water and sewer use. The Tracts should also be a dedication for future Platte Canyon expansion if and when the need is identified. This dedication would match the right of way width dedicated to the north of this property.
12. The Preliminary plan design would not restrict left turns and would allow traffic to use the access as full movement. We will require a raised median island to control the turn movements. I can provide a design with signing called out.

Drainage

The site contours show the site runoff will be directed away from SH 75. With this understanding we have no objection to the site grading as provided.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 303-512-4271.

Sincerely,
Brad Sheehan P.E.
Access Engineer

Urban Drainage and Flood Control

This letter is in response to your request for our comments concerning the referenced project. We appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal. We have reviewed this proposal only as it relates to major drainage features, in this case Drainageway D. We have the following comments to offer:

1. We have no objection to the concept.
2. We would appreciate the opportunity to review the drainage report and construction plans as they become available.
3. This proposal contains no UDFCD maintenance eligible features (all closed conduits). Areas to the east of Middlefield Road (Brookhaven) are eligible and will continue to be so.

City of Littleton

We offer the following comments regarding this Plat:

1. We recommend the detached sidewalk along Platte Canyon Road be constructed having a concrete surface as an all-weather walkway. The width be a CDOT standard width of 5 feet. We suggest this Plat be forwarded the CDOT for their review.
2. The designated FEMA Zone X floodplain as shown on the Plat impacts 13 of the 24 lots being platted. We recommend the house construction be in accordance with FEMA Regulations. In this case, the house finished first floor may have to be at least one foot above the flood elevation on the lot. (Basements are not allowed unless the finished basement floor is one foot above the flood elevation of the lot.) Also, the furnace and hot water tanks need to be flood protected and cannot be located in the crawl space under the house.

3. We recommend this plat be forwarded to the Urban Drainage & Flood Control District for review and comment, if not already done so.
4. It is difficult to read on the Plat the proposed improvements to be constructed along Platte Canyon Road (71' ROW). It appears the existing curb, gutter and asphalt right turn lane will be extended to the south property line of the Plat and then taper to the existing edge of pavement.

Xcel Energy

The comments from Xcel Energy were their standard comments on a proposed subdivision

Platte Canyon Water and Sanitation District (Summary)

A "Will Serve Letter" from the District was submitted with the application but no further comments have been received.

Denver Water

I have reviewed your plan set and have the following concerns. There appears by our records that there is a residence located at 6051 Middlefield Road. What the plans for this location? Denver Water will require a full set of water plans to be submitted for the new waterline being installed. On this set of plans we will require that some sort of building footprint or lot layout with proposed service line and meter locations be shown. There is also a creek crossing that will need to be defined for a water line crossing. The road way will need to be dedicated R.O.W. or an easement granted to Denver Water prior to construction.

Vincent Gaiter Sales Administration Supervisor

Arapahoe County

The County Planning Division had no comments. The County Public Works Dept. stated:

1. Sight triangles should be provided at the proposed entrances onto both access roads (S. Platte Canyon and Middlefield Rd). Ensure the required town wall is located outside the sight triangles. Additionally, ensure the potential development signage is outside the sight triangle distance or below the height restrictions.
2. Nevada Ditch Easement runs through property. Contact the Nevada Ditch Holding Co. at 144 W. Colfax; Denver, Colorado 80001 for any construction restraints and/or restrictions.
3. Property is located within Platte Canyon Water & Sanitation District. Contact PCWSD at 8739 W Coal Mine Ave, Littleton, CO 80123 · (303) 979-2333 for any construction restraints and/or restrictions.

Littleton School Dist. (Summary)

We do not see any concerns for school buses to enter or exit Platte Canyon Rd. or Middlefield Rd.

South Suburban Park and Recreation

Dear Phil,

The Wilder Lane Development Plan appears to have privately maintained open space and trails. The District assumes this meets any park land dedication requirements or cash-in-lieu required of the developer to the City or South Suburban.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this development proposal.

Best Regards,

Brett Collins, PLA

Country Club Villas HOA

1. Access to Platte Canyon Road – should be “full” access including left-in and left-out. Making a left turn is only problematic during morning and evening rush hours. Residents coming back from Southwest Plaza and those wanting to go south on Platte Canyon Road, other than at those busy times, would most likely want the option of left-in, left-out. This would also reduce the pressure on Middlefield Road, Wilder Lane, and traffic thru the Village subdivision.
2. Potential future access restriction (i.e. “gated”) from Platte Canyon Road into Wilder Lane should be left to the Board of Trustees, not the Wilder Lane HOA. Traffic flow thru our community is the responsibility of the Town, not individual HOA's.
3. There is still no provision for any type of screening on the northeast property line bordering the west boundary of Country Club Villas. The P&Z committee in approving the original submitted plan recommended that the parties resolve this issue with some type of border, i.e. a fence or planted screen. In addition, the issue still needs to be resolved as to who is responsible for maintaining the easement between the Wilder Lane and Country Club Villas property along that stretch.
4. Proposed pavement width is only 26 feet, not nearly enough, particularly when there is no additional designated off-street parking. Pedestrian, bicycle, and golf cart traffic will also be present and such a narrow street presents a safety issue.
5. There needs to be a follow-thru commitment that only single story homes will be built adjacent to the Country Club Villas west and south property lines.
6. An agreement between the parties needs to exist relative to shared maintenance of the Country Club Villas south wall since there will not be an additional wall constructed.
7. There should be included in any submitted plan more information detailing proposed layouts, set back dimensions, elevations, and materials to be used in construction. The elevation examples provided don't appear to have the

consistent look and be of the quality of the stone and stucco finish of homes recently or currently being built. They are also not the same ones submitted to the P&Z Committee on 4/8/14 when Wilder Commons was seeking approval.

8. Encroachment into setback areas for architectural features (roof overhangs, etc.) should be restricted for residences built next to our south wall.
9. Density is too high, particularly on the Jurgelonis property. The proposed density is 3.4 per acre on the west portion and 4 per acre south of us. We believe such tightness would cheapen our community and have a negative impact on our property values. Density should be more in line with the surrounding area – Country Club Villas is 3.2 per acre and Willowcroft 2.95 per acre.
10. The proposed perimeter fencing (“horizontal slat type”) connecting to our south wall and running east should be of similar stucco material to present an uninterrupted and uniform look.
11. Not enough open space – only calling for approximately 14.6%. Previously approved plan called for 18.4 % open space.
12. Tract A calls for a water quality pond that borders directly on Middlefield Road. Why not have the drainage tie directly into the existing catch basin underneath Middlefield road directly east of Augusta Drive. This would eliminate the need for a land depression and provide for a more pleasing look at the entrance.
13. Any damage to our HOA property either to the west or south as a result of construction activity will be the responsibility of the developer to return it to its original condition.
14. There should be no high level street lights.

The Village HOA

There does not appear to be a consensus within The Village, relative to the new development, Wilder Lane. The developers have taken extremely thorough steps in ample discussions with homeowners in The Village, to flush out concerns and react to those concerns.

1. There has been discussion concerning the New Century modern look. Those discussions were mixed, as there was considerable support also for homes of a more modern look. One strong comment was made that “if I have to look at that, I will sell and move”.
2. Density concerns have been voiced, due to the lack of a cap on the density.
3. Setbacks are a concern – comparing Wilder Lane proposed homes to the homes approved and being built now in a very dense Willowcroft.

4. Fences have been mentioned more than most other issues, especially for those home owners who border the south of the new development. There is concern about not knowing exactly what materials will be used and what the fences will look like.

Why are there fences planned between the houses? None of the rest of Columbine Valley has that and we all enjoy the open feeling of our community.

5. Roofs are a concern, in not knowing what materials will be used.

6. The quality of building materials to be used in the homes is a concern – due to the unknowns. This concern is teamed with the fact that there will not be a chance to see what the actual home will look like until it is built.

7. There seems to be a lack of clarity on the target market, therefore bringing up some concern for off street parking needs, width of street and impact on traffic.

8. There are drainage concerns, especially with the elevation differences necessary on the south west part of the proposed development, adjacent to Platte Canyon.

Jim Roller

In addition to the comments from the Village HOA we also received a letter signed by the residents abutting the south boundary of the Wilder Lane project:

Bill Weider Survey
9/4/14
Wilder Lane

Bill did a survey of the homeowners in the Village that abut the Wilder Lane property. Items of concern are:

- Density
- Would like fence as built for Villa Avignon (Back of Town Hall)
- Setbacks
- Must be "age marketed"
- No fences between lots
- No street parking, or visitor parking other than on lots.
- Elevated lots
- Existing trees along Nevada Ditch-To remain?
- Mailbox locations.

Brookhaven Estates HOA

Subject: Wilder Lane Preliminary Plan- Residents Comments

As requested, here is a summary of comments received from Brookhaven residents concerning the proposed Wilder Lane development:

- Skepticism has been raised that the Wilder Lane round-about is not sufficient to deter morning cut-through traffic which could continue east on Brookhaven Lane, disrupting the neighborhood. A sign installed on northbound Platte Canyon Road at Wilder Lane is strongly recommended: "6AM-9AM- No Right Turn- Except Wilder Lane Vehicles".
- Add a stop sign in Brookhaven to discourage cut-through traffic (some do not support this idea.)
- The density of the development is too high.
- The general appearance of the architecture is not pleasing or consistent with the high quality reflected in neighboring communities.

Villa Avignon HOA

To: Columbine Valley Town Planner

From: Villa Avignon HOA

Subject: Wilder Lane Preliminary Plan Residents Comments

As requested, here is a summary of comments received from Villa Avignon residents concerning the proposed Wilder Lane development:

- The elevation drawings submitted by the developer have raised several concerns about the style and attractiveness of the architecture, its compatibility with Columbine Valley and the perceived quality/pricing level of the homes. More information is requested on price ranges.
- A concern has been raised about the potential of "cut through" rush hour traffic from northbound Platte Canyon Road ending up on Middlefield Road and then Brookhaven Lane. It is suggested that the developer and Town investigate street design, signs and other diversion options that would minimize or eliminate this possibility.
- Supports a right in/right out only onto Platte Canyon in order to minimize traffic flow into the area.
- There is a concern about the density level, particularly on the eastern side of the development.
- The plan (landscape, monuments and design) for the entrance into the development from Middlefield needs further clarification.
- The plan should include a definition of the construction materials and exterior appearance that is proposed. The elevation drawings do not do an adequate job of providing this level of detail. Based on the recent Willowcroft experience, it is felt this needs greater attention in the planning approval process. From the drawings submitted, concern exists that the quality of stone and siding proposed is not of the quality used in neighboring developments.

- With the ongoing construction traffic along Middlefield, will the Town be in a position to recover the cost of repaving our streets from the developer/builder?

In addition to the comments of the HOA's there were letters received from:

Linda Mansur, 9 Village Drive. She has concerns with the density, setbacks and street widths.

Nick Nichelson and Ginny Rogliano, 15 Driver Lane. They have concerns with the density and consistency with the Master Plan.

The letters are attached.

The remaining agencies had no comments or did not respond.

V. Illustrative Landscaping and Screening

The PDP Plan includes preliminary locations of trees and planting beds. Fencing locations are also proposed on the plan. The final development plan will call out species and sizes.

It appears that the applicant and the Village residents along the south boundary have tentatively reached an agreement concerning a fence. The treatment along the north side of the property to be the Town Wall bordering the commercial center parking area and wood or artificial wood for the north border on lots 8 and 7. There is existing wall along the north boundary of the Jurgelonis site (Country Club Villas wall). On the west side of the property the plans show the continuation of the Town wall along South Platte Canyon Road. Fencing is called out in the Development Stipulations Chart along the east side bordering Country Club Villas but is not shown on the plan.

VI. Traffic

A. Traffic Impact Report

The application includes a Traffic Impact Study prepared by the Town's traffic consultant. The study analyzed the existing traffic conditions in the project area and estimated the projected traffic volumes and peak hour impacts for the area after the project is built out. The proposed movements from Wilder Lane to Middlefield Road are a full movement, while the movements onto Platte Canyon Road are proposed as right-in/right-out. The existing and projected impacts are summarized as follows:

Existing and Projected Traffic Volumes ADT (Average Daily Trips)	
Existing (2012)	16,000 Platte Canyon Road 2350 Middlefield R. (with Willowcroft build out)
Projected-Wilder Lane Build Out	132

The 20 year projection of daily trips for Platte Canyon Road is not available at this time. The Town's traffic consultant will prepare the Phase II traffic impact analysis for Wild Plum Farms and the 20 year projections will be available in that report. In any event the projected 132 daily trips for Wilder Lane will not have a significant impact of the future Platte Canyon volumes.

The best indicators of traffic congestion are the AM and PM traffic counts. The existing counts and projected counts are as follows:

AM/PM Peak Hour- Platte Canyon Road at Wilder Lane	
2012 Existing (AM/PM)	1367/1447 Vehicles Per Hour (VPH)
Projected Wilder Lane (AM/PM)	7/6 VPH

AM/PM Peak Hour-Wilder Lane At Middlefield Road	
2012 Existing (AM/PM)	126/170 VPH
Projected Wilder Lane	13/10
20 Year Projected	N/A

The traffic study also analyzed the proposed intersections Level of Service (LOS) ratings and projected future LOS ratings. The Level of Service rating for a street or intersection can range from "A" (very little delay) to "F"

(significant delays). The existing and projected LOS (AM/PM) for the proposed intersection is:

Level of Service (LOS) Platte Canyon Road at Bowles	
Existing Level Out AM/PM	D/E
20 Year Projection	N/A

Level of Service (LOS) Wilder Lane at Platte Canyon Road	
Projected Build Out AM/PM	C/B

Level of Service (LOS) Wilder Lane at Middlefield Road	
Projected Build Out AM/PM	A/A

B. Cut Through Traffic

Concerns have been expressed about the potential for cut through traffic by vehicles northbound on Platte Canyon Road in the morning peak hours. The staff does not accept the argument that cut through traffic would be a serious problem. If it were, there would be evidence that cut troughs are occurring at a high level through the Village subdivision. As part of the Wild Plum Farms Phase I Traffic Study, the turn movement at Platte Canyon Rd. and Village Court were monitored (March 2014). During the AM peak hour(s), 7:00-9:00AM, there was a total of 15 vehicles turning right from Platte Canyon onto Village Court. If we assume the worst possible cut through case and that all of the right turning drivers were cutting through to Middlefield and then to Bowles, (no Village residents or service vehicles) the total calculates to one vehicle cutting through every 8 minutes. If we narrow the analysis to the Peak Period (the 45 minute period between 7:30AM and 8:15 AM), the total right turns from Platte Canyon onto Village Court was 12 vehicles or an average of one cut through trip every 5 minutes. This level of cut through traffic does not constitute a significant problem; it is at most, a minor inconvenience.

C. Platte Canyon Road

1. Platte Canyon Road is a State Highway. The highway right-of-way is within the Town of Columbine Valley and is classified as an Arterial in the Town's street plan. The highway right-of-way does not meet the standard for an Arterial. Both the Town and CDOT are requesting dedication or reservation of land for additional right of way along the frontage of Wilder Lane.

2. The preliminary plan calls for a trail along the frontage from the access point to the north boundary of the site. Both CDOT and the City of Littleton have recommended the continuation of the sidewalk that now extends from Bowles Ave., to the site boundary. The staff is opposed to the extension of the sidewalk all the way to the south property line because it would lead pedestrians to a point where no sidewalk exists and rather than go back to the crossing at the Bowles signal, they would cross the highway at an unsafe location.

VII. Report of the Town Engineer

The complete comments of the Town Engineer are included in the Long Letter which is a list of all the staff comments and requests for revisions and clarification and which was sent to the applicant. The major concerns are:

- A. The Town standard for local roads is 50-ft right-of-way width, 36-ft pavement width and 3-ft wide concrete pans on each side of the road. **The original cross section proposed by the applicant has been revised and now shows a 32' R-O-W, a pavement width of 26' and 3' pans on each side.**
- B. Arapahoe County requires 100-ft minimum radius for centerline curves of local roads (30-35 mph). The Wilder Lane proposed 50-ft radius roadway curves would require a posted speed limit of 15 mph.
- C. Historically, stormwater runoff from approximately 73 acres of off-site drainage basin, located west of the site, has entered the Wilder Lane property along the west and north property lines and passed overland through the site. The anticipated off-site flow during the 100-year storm event (~210 cfs) is substantial. The Wilder Lane development will be required to safely pass the off-site drainage through the development via storm sewer or surface flow in drainage easements. The preliminary plan/plat and Phase 1 drainage report have been updated to include a large inlet structure at the northwest side of property, adjacent to S. Platte Canyon Rd., and a concrete channel along the north property line. The intake and concrete channel are designed to collect and convey off-site runoff through the Wilder Lane development.
- D. The Nevada Ditch channel banks appear to encroach into private lots. This could result in future maintenance concerns and a need for coordination with Denver Water/Nevada Ditch Co. by the individual property owners. Records that clearly show the existing Nevada Ditch easement and documentation that Denver Water/Nevada Ditch Co. have reviewed and approved the proposed changes to the ditch have not been submitted.

VIII Findings

The staff has reviewed the preliminary development plan and plat, the supporting documents and has conducted site visits. Based on these reviews and site visits the following findings are presented.

A. Master Plan Consistency

The Master Plan density designation for this site is Low-High with densities from 2.4 and higher. The west parcel of the site is zoned MUPD (Mixed Use Planned Development) which allows a range of land uses including residential. The east parcel is zoned R-A which will require rezoning to RPD (Residential Planned Development). The applicant is proposing rezoning to RPD for both properties.

The proposed use of the property, single family residential and the proposed density is consistent with the Master Plan designation.

B. Compatibility with Adjacent Residential Development

There are two residential areas in close proximity to the proposed development. The proposed development compares with these residential areas as follows:

1. Density and Lot Size.

As proposed Wilder Lane would have a density of 3.6 DU's per acre with lot sizes ranging from 7,188-11,085 square feet. The average lot size on the western portion is 8,914 square feet and on the eastern portion, 7,360 square feet.

Country Club Villas lies immediately to the east and consists of 8 single family homes on 2.5 acres, a density of 3.1 DU Acre. The only access is from Middlefield Road. The lot sizes range from 7,600 to 9,700 S.F. with an average of 8,500 S.F. The Village lies immediately to the south and consists of 60 single family homes on 25.15 acres a density of 2.4 DU's per acre. The lot sizes are estimated to range from 8,300 to 21,800 S.F. with an average of 13,300 S.F.

The comparison in lot size is misleading in that both Country Club Villas and the Village have street R-O-W's of 50' compared to 32' ROW for Wilder Lane.

The Wilder Commons density (3.63 DU's per acre) is higher than either of the two adjoining neighborhoods but the Master Plan had envisioned a higher density for this site. The lot sizes are similar to Country Club Villas and considerably smaller than the Village.

Architectural Style.

The architectural exhibits in the preliminary plan illustrate a contemporary style that varies significantly from the adjacent neighborhoods. The staff does not critique structural architecture but we have visited individual sites developed by the applicant and note that actual visits can give a different impression than the plan exhibits.

The applicant is not showing illustrations of homes that would be built precisely as shown. On Sheet 1 of the Preliminary Plan They have included a narrative note that states the design intention:

As shown, there would be are intrusions into the front set-back for decks and patios which would place them within the utility easement. However, this will be revised.

In summary, the staff finds that while the density proposed is higher than that in the adjacent neighborhoods, it is not inconsistent with the goals of the Master Plan. The lot sizes are similar to those in Country Club Villas but that is somewhat achieved through the reduction of street R-O-W.

C. Landscaping and Screening

The landscape plan is illustrative only and indicates screening on the south, west and north property lines using fencing. The Plan specifies the Town Wall along the west property line. The Town wall will be constructed adjacent to the commercial area parking lot and a wood or artificial wood fence has been proposed adjacent to the buildings in the commercial property (along Lots 7 and 8). Along the north property line that borders the Country Club Villas, the proposed plans will leave the existing wall to screen the proposed development. The Country Club Villas HOA has requested a wall along the east common property line while the applicant has not shown fencing or screening on the east side. However a late note from the applicant states they will do landscaping along the east boundary.

The landscaping plan for the west sections call for a wood or artificial wood fence that would connect at the east end of the County Club Villas wall and extend to the open space area (Tracts A & B and around those tracts. The staff feels the transition from a masonry wall to wood or artificial wood may be visually unattractive and that a wood fence parallel to Middlefield detracts from the quality of the entrance design. We suggest the applicant consider a wrought iron fence instead.

D. Traffic Impact, Access and Streets

1. The traffic impact of 132 VPD (Vehicles per Day) generated by a built out Wilder Lane with would be minimal. It is projected that 45 trips per day would exit or access Platte Canyon Road which is presently carrying in excess of 16,000 VPD). There would be a projected 87 trips per day onto Middlefield Road which will be carrying approximately 2350 VPD after Willowcroft builds out.

The-AM Peak Hour projection is 20 trips, 7 onto Platte Canyon and 13 onto Middlefield (10 northbound and 3 southbound.) If the access to Platte Canyon was a full access the numbers do not change significantly.

2. The applicant is proposing a modified cross section for the internal street (Wilder Lane). The Town standard for a local street is a 50' right-of-way and a pavement width of 36'. The applicant proposes a 32' R-O-W and a pavement width of 26' plus 3' pans on each side
3. Platte Canyon Road is currently at near capacity. The ability to alleviate the critical problem requires additional right-of-way. Both CDOT and the Town staff are requesting dedication or reservations of additional right of way along the Wilder Lane frontage. The applicant is agreeable to provide the necessary right of way for any widening of Platte Canyon Road at no cost to the Town but would prefer to leave it as a reservation at this time.
4. The recommendation by CDOT and the City of Littleton to extend the existing sidewalk from the north boundary is not supported by Town staff for safety reasons. The applicant is now agreeable to a sidewalk extending from Tract H (Drainage Easement) to their north property line. The staff is agreeable to this revision

E. Drainage

1. The original Phase I Drainage Report included design and calculations for collection of on-site stormwater management; including anticipated runoff, conveyance along street/R.O.W., collection by storm sewers and discharge to water quality ponds. Recently, the drainage report was updated to include design for existing off-site stormwater runoff that will pass through the site. The off-site runoff will enter Wilder Lane along the west and north property lines. Plan updates include addition of a large storm inlet structure at the west side of property and a concrete channel at the north side of property to collect and safely convey the off-site runoff.
2. Final calculations for street capacity, intake capacity, water quality pond grading, and pond outlet structures will be completed during Final Design.

F. Plan Notes

Conditions note # 3. There appears to be no limit on the amount of encroachment into the side and rear yards. Certain encroachments should have limitations, i.e., cantilevers, bay windows, chimneys air handling units, etc. Patios and decks are sometimes allowed to extend to the property line and sometimes are limited. The encroachment limits should be specified.

Development Notes

It is not the purpose of plan and plat notes to help market a project. Plan and plat notes are for legal purposes. The following words in the 2nd paragraph note. *"That drove these modern home pioneers"* and *"restrained elegance"* are inappropriate. This language could be in the Letter of Intent.

Last note. Wilder Lane is a local street. The purpose of a local street is to provide access from the homes in the area to the collector system and from the collector system to the homes. A public street is for the public, not for a specified segment. The following language, *"This access is strictly for the use of Wilder Lane residents and emergency personnel."* Is inappropriate.

G. Other

1. There has been some discussion concerning the financial responsibility for any and all of the public improvements required to develop the site. The applicant is responsible for all the public

improvement required for the development of the site. The Town is not required to participate in those costs.

2. The staff has found several minor errors and omissions and items that need clarification. These are not items that have a substantial effect and are easily corrected. They are spelled out in our detailed Long Letter to the applicant.

IX PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

At their hearing on September 9, 2014, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted to recommend the case favorably subject to the conditions stated in Section X and the staff conditions.

X Recommendations

Based on the findings in Section IX and the **Planning and Zoning Commission** actions the staff offers the following recommendations:

- A. Revise the plat and plan to eliminate the minor errors and omissions either prior to the Board of Trustees meeting or with the Final Plat and Plan submittal, as appropriate. **The applicant has agreed.**
- B. **The conditions specified in by the Planning and Zoning Commission, as follows:**
 1. **Water detention/quality ponds landscape plans.**
 2. **Complete review of building setbacks: (15' at lots 1-5, 12-14, 23, 24).***
 3. **Site elevations comparing building heights between the Village and Wilder Lane and roof heights comparing the Village and Wilder Lane and Country Club Villas and Wilder Lane**
 4. **Detailed landscape plan of entrance fencing/monuments and landscaping along Middlefield Road**
 5. **Detail concrete path/sidewalk from Platte Canyon entrance/open space north to shopping center.***
 6. **Better definition of architectural style and materials, including 4-5 actual front and rear elevations/rendering of models of homes to be built**
 7. **Commitment of HOA to maintain all open space including front and back yards and improvements on open space**
 8. **Conduct discussions with neighboring HOAs regarding maintenance of perimeter walls and fences. If no agreement is reached prior to Final conditions will be imposed.**

- C. Prior to scheduling the case for the Board of Trustee's meeting, the applicant will revise the Phase I Drainage Study as specified by the Town Engineer. The applicant has agreed to **address comments and concerns.**
- E. Revise road cross section to meet the requirements of Article X, Section 1, Local Street. **The applicant has agreed to a modification that would increase the street width and R-O-W to 32'.**
- F. Prior to submittal of the Final Plan the applicant's designer will prepare a detailed landscaping plan with both plan and street elevations for the Town staff to review. **The applicant has agreed.**
- G. With the submittal of the Final Plan the applicant will submit architectural exhibits illustrating the design of the units to be built and notes providing assurances that the units will be constructed as shown on the exhibits. **The applicant agree to illustrate four models on the Final Development Plan and will discuss this issue further.**
- H. **Revise the Plan notes as specified in the Findings section.**
- I. Adress the staff concern regarding the transition from masonry to wood along the north boundary (with Country Club Villas). **The applicant will address this issue at the meeting.**
- J. **Revise the Development Stipulations Chart on Sheet 1 of the Preliminary Development Plan as shown below (in red font and strikeout)**

Development Stipulations	
ACREAGE	6.67 acres
DENSITY	3.63 DU/AC
BUILDING COVERAGE	45%
OPEN SPACE-PUBLIC, COMON, YARDS	38.5%
Building Height Maximum	
Building Height Maximum (2 Story) – Lots 7-10	
One Story (1)	30' 0"
Two Story (2) Lots 7-10	35'-0"
Setbacks	
South Platte Canyon Road ROW	25'-0"
<u>Front</u>	
Wilder Lane ROW to Residence	10' 0"
Wilder Lane ROW to Garage Facing Street	20' 0"
<u>Side</u>	
Rear	5' 0"
	10'-0"
Lots 1-5, 12-14, 23, 24	15"
All other lots	10'

Parking	
Off Street	96(4 per Lot)
Signage	Number and Dimensions
Project Identification	TBD
Tenant Identification (Ground Mounted)	N/A
Tenant Identification (Building Fascia)	N/A
Temporary	TBD
Walls, Fences, Hedges	Type, Materials, Height
North Property Line	Town Wall, Wood, Artificial Wood, or Existing CCV Wall
East Property Line	Landscaped Buffer
South Property Line	Wood or Artificial Wood
West Property Line	Town Wall & Wrought Iron
Exterior Lighting	See Narrative

September 6, 2014

Planning and Zoning Commission
Town of Columbine Valley
Columbine Valley, Colorado 80123

Gentlemen:

Recently several things have been brought to my attention concerning the planned development behind my home on the property called Wilder Lane.

I have multiple issues with the existing plans. One major concern is density. It is my understanding that the development will have a total of 14 houses with very little set-back from the street and minuscule distance between houses. The streets in the area will be far narrower than other streets in town. Fences will be permitted between houses. There will be no amenities and no open space.

Other concerns have been addressed in a letter that I have signed. That letter covers several technical issues such as drainage. My property does not connect directly to the area being developed because of the Nevada Ditch and the large irregular shaped backyard of one of my neighbors. As a member of the community for thirty-six years I believe that this development as presented at this time is in no way compatible with the town as a whole and should not be approved.

I feel that the developers are requesting far too many exceptions to building codes, rules, and guidelines for building in Columbine Valley. The area has retained its original beauty because in the past leaders have considered the overall appearance of the town. Please continue that tradition.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and for your service to the community.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Linda Mansur".

Linda Mansur

9 Village Drive

Columbine Valley, Colorado 80123

October 5, 2014

Town of Columbine Valley
2 Middlefield Road
Columbine Valley, Colorado 80123

Re: Development of Wilder Lane

Dear Mayor Christy and Columbine Valley Trustees,

We will be unable to attend the next Trustee meeting on Tuesday October 21st so we wanted to comment on the proposed Wilder Lane development.

We attended the initial Public Hearing on the Nelson property and also the Public Hearing on September 9, 2014.

We listened to many resident comments and concerns regarding the traffic impact, the density and the architectural style.

It is difficult to comprehend how the Planning and Zoning committee approved this development.

During his presentation Mr. Don Slack referred to the higher density at both the Country Club Villas and Villa Avignon, when attempting to justify the proposed high density at Wilder Lane.

2.

It should be noted and recognized that both of these communities he referenced were developed before the Master Plan was approved on May 15, 2007.

Therefore the comparisons are irrelevant.

Mr. Slack was a Columbine Trustee at that time.

The Master Plan classifies the Nelson and Jurgelonis properties as Low to High.

Can there be a reasonable compromise on the proposed density?

How does the density of 24 patio homes on this property enhance our community?

When referencing the Columbine Valley Master Plan, which we recognize is just a guideline, on page 14 some pertinent points under Goals are:

- * Maintain the low-density residential focus of the community.
- * Ensure that all future residential development is compatible with adjacent existing development.
- * Ensure that new development enhances or has no adverse effects upon the Town's property base and financial viability.

It is concerning that the proposed development would go forward considering the density and the architectural style.

It obviously is not compatible with the existing development in the community.

Has the vision for our community changed?

3.

We are not opposed to development but do feel it should be conducted in a reasonable and responsible manner.

Many residents attend the meetings but our voices continue to be unheard.

Perhaps it is time to really evaluate what is truly in the best interest of the Columbine Valley community.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Nick Nicholson and Ginny Rogliano

Nick Nicholson and Ginny Rogliano
15 Driver Lane
Columbine Valley, Colorado