



2 Middlefield Road  
Columbine Valley, CO 80123  
(303) 795-1434

**AGENDA  
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION**

**Tuesday September 9, 2014  
6:30 PM  
Town Hall**

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Previous Minutes
- III. Set October 14<sup>th</sup> Date of Public Hearing for Revised Land Use Regulations.
- IV. PUBLIC HEARING

**PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL,  
WILDER COMMONS, SOUTH PLATTE CANYON ROAD APPROXIMATELY 1/8  
MILE SOUTH OF BOWLES AVENUE AND AT 6051 SOUTH MIDDLEFIELD ROAD.  
PLATTE CANYON PARTNERS, LLC, APPLICANT.**

- I. Staff Report (Town Planner)
- II. Applicant Response and Presentation
- III. HOA Response and Comments
- IV. Public Comments

**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.

**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**

<b>Land Use Tabulation</b>		
Land Use:	Single Family Residential	
Maximum Allowable Units:	24	
Maximum Allowable Density:	3.63 DU/Acre	
Zoning Designation: Existing	MU (Mixed Use)/ R-A	
	Proposed	RPD (Residential Planned Development)
<b>Area Tabulation</b>		
<b>Use</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Rights of Way	1.094 Acres	16.53%
Open Space/Tracts	0.968 Acre	14.64%
Lotted Area	4.555 Acres	68.83%
Total	6.617 Acres	100.00%

<b>Development Stipulations</b>	
<b>Building Height Maximum (1 Story) – Lots 1-6 &amp; 11-24</b>	30'-0"
<b>Building Height Maximum (2 Story) – Lots 7-10</b>	35'-0"
<b>Setbacks</b>	
South Platte Canyon Road ROW	25'-0"
<b>Front:</b>	
Wilder Lane ROW to Residence	10'-0"
Wilder Lane ROW to Garage Facing Street	20'-0"
Side: Residence	5'-0"
Rear:	10'-0"
<b>Minimum Distance Between Buildings:</b>	
Garage to Garage	6'-0"
Garage to Residence on Adj. Lot	8'-0"
Residence to Residence	10'-0"
<b>Parking</b>	
Off Street	96(4 per Lot)
<b>Signage</b>	
	<b>Number and Dimensions</b>
Project Identification	To Be Determined
Temporary	To Be Determined
<b>Walls, Fences, Hedges</b>	
	<b>Type, Materials, Height</b>
North Property Line	Town Wall, Wood, Artificial Wood, or Existing CCV Wall
East Property Line	Wood or Artificial Wood
South Property Line	Wood or Artificial Wood
West Property Line	Town Wall or Wrought Iron
<b>Exterior Lighting</b>	See Narrative

**Sheet 2:** Shows the site plan including perimeter boundaries, lot layout, access points, road alignment, typical 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.

<b>Tract Summary Chart</b>					
Tract	Area (SF)	Area (AC)	Use	Ownership	Maintenance
Tract A	4,945	0.114	Open Space Drainage/Trails	HOA	HOA
Tract B	3,876	0.89	Open Space Drainage/Trails	HOA	HOA
Tract C	1,509	0.035	Open Space Drainage/Trails	HOA	HOA
Tract D	18,172	0.417	Open Space Drainage/Trails	HOA	HOA
Tract E	4,244	0.097	Open Space Drainage/Trails	HOA	HOA
Tract F	8,169	0.188	Open Space Drainage/Trails	HOA	HOA
Tract G	1,257	0.029	Open Space	HOA	HOA
Total Tract Area	42,172	0.968			
Total Lot Area	198,407	4.555			
Total ROW Area	47,654	1.094			
Total Site Area	288,233	6.617			

**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**

To whom it may concern:

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  
Denver Water | t: 303-628-6527

### **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**

As of 9/3/14 we had not received a response from the Village HOA.

### **Brookhaven Estates HOA**

From: Brookhaven 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?

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:

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

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:

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

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

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:

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

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

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

**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 throughs 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 a Major Arterial in the Town's street plan. The highway right-of-way does not meet the standard for a Major 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 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 Wilder Lane proposed 30-ft right-of-way, 26-ft pavement width and 2-ft pan width are too narrow.
- 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 80 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 flows during major storm events (~140-200 cfs) are 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 not addressed the off-site runoff concerns.

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 30' ROW for Wilder Lane. The staff feels that the road standard and the amount of common open space have been sacrificed to achieve larger lots.

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. They have included a narrative note that states:

---

#### **ARCHITECTURE:**

**WILDER LANE WILL BE DEVELOPED AS A CONTEMPORARY/MODERN HOME SUBDIVISION REMINISCENT OF THE MID-CENTURY HOME DEVELOPMENTS THAT WERE COMPLETED IN THE DENVER AREA AFTER WORLD WAR II.**

**THE SAME TENANTS THAT DROVE THOSE MODERN HOME PIONEERS -SIMPLE MATERIALS, RESTRAINED ELEGANCE, SMALLER FOOTPRINTS, INNOVATIVE CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES -WILL BE REINTERPRETED TO MEET OUR 21ST CENTURY LIFESTYLE: CLEAN ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN, SEAMLESS INDOOR-OUTDOOR LIVING, AND 'GREEN' CONSTRUCTION METHODS.**

**THE EXTERIOR MATERIALS PALLETTE WILL VARY FROM HOUSE TO HOUSE AS WILL THE DESIGN, BUT EACH WILL COMPLIMENT THE OTHER TO FORM AN ARCHITECTURALLY SIGNIFICANT COMMUNITY. MATERIALS EXPECTED TO BE USED INCLUDE WOOD OR HARDBOARD SIDING, STUCCO, METAL, STONE, BRICK OR OTHER TYPES OF ARCHITECTURAL MASONRY.**

**ROOF LINES WILL ALSO VARY FROM NEAR FLAT TO SLOPING, AGAIN, REMINISCENT OF MID-CENTURY MODERN FORMS.**

---

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. Also the rear yard setback at 10' is minimal and the applicant needs to address this issue.

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 size is achieved through the reduction of street R-O-W.



**B. 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.

**C. 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 30' 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.
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.

D. **Drainage**

The Phase I Drainage Study is incomplete and not acceptable. The Town Engineer has expressed concerns on how the upstream flows from the 100 year event will be conveyed across the site. This issue must be addressed as part of the preliminary plan approval.

E. **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. Town staff has legal concerns about the optional gate at the entrance of Wilder Lane from Platte Canyon Road. Since the roads are publically maintained, there could be legal issue with this optional closure.
3. 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 Recommendations**

Based on the findings in Section VIII, 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. 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 resolve this issue.**
- C. Revise road cross section to meet the requirements of Article X, Section 1, Local Street. **The applicant has agreed to a modification that would retain the 30' R-O-W but increase the street width to 32'.**

F. Revise the Tract Summary Chart on Sheet 1 of the Preliminary Plat to read as shown in **red font: The applicant does not agree to dedicate the highway R-O-W but agrees to reserve the R-O-W. The staff is recommending dedication but is open to leaving the question of dedication or reservation to the Final Plan stage.**

Tract E	4,244	0.097	<b>Highway Right of Way/Open Space Drainage/Trails</b>	HOA/Town	HOA
Tract F	8,169	0.188	<b>Highway Right of Way/Open Space Drainage/Trails</b>	HOA/Town	HOA

G. 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.**

H. 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 exhibits and notes will comply with any additional conditions requested by the Planning Commission and Board of Trustees when this preliminary plan is presented to them. **The applicant does not agree with the recommendation as stated and wishes to discuss.**

I. The applicant needs to justify the short rear yard set-back called out in the Development Stipulations Chart.