

**PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN, AND PRELIMINARY PLAT APPROVAL, WILDER COMMONS, SOUTH PLATTE CANYON ROAD APPROXIMATELY 1/8 MILE SOUTH OF BOWLES AVENUE.**

**PLATTE CANYON PARTNERS, LLC, APPLICANT.**

**I. Purpose and Location**

This is a request for Preliminary Development Plan (PDP), and Preliminary Plat approval for sixteen (16) single family lots on a 4.1 acre site. The site is zoned MU (Mixed Use) which permits the proposed use. The land is owned by Nelson Real Estate Properties, Inc., and is under contract to the applicant, Platte Canyon Partnership. It is bounded on the north by Platte Canyon Square commercial development, west by Platte Canyon Road, on the south by the Village in Columbine Valley and on the east by Country Club Villas and the Jurgelonis Property.

**II. Plan and Plat Description (Attached)**

**A. The PDP (Preliminary Development Plan) consists of six sheets:**

**Sheet 1:** Contains is the cover sheet including standard notes, project team, certifications and signature blocks, and vicinity map. Sheet 1 also includes the development stipulations chart.

**DEVELOPMENT STIPULATIONS CHART**

<b><i>Land Use Tabulation</i></b>		
Land Use:	Single Family Residential	
Maximum Allowable Units:	16	
Maximum Allowable Density:	4.0 DU/Acre	
Zoning Designation:	MU (Mixed Use)	
<b>Area Tabulation</b>		
<b>Use</b>	<b>Area</b>	<b>% of Total</b>
Roads/Tract D	0.455 Acre	11.05%
Open Space/Tracts	0.757 Acre	18.39%
Lotted Area	2.905 Acres	70.56%

Total	4.117 Acres	100.00%
-------	-------------	---------

<b>Development Stipulations</b>	
<b>Building Height Maximum</b>	30'-0"
<b><u>Setbacks</u></b>	
South Platte Canyon Road ROW	25'-0"
<u>Front:</u>	
Side Loaded Garage	2'-0"
Front Loaded Garage	5'-0"
Residence Front	20'-0"
<u>Side:</u>	
Side Loaded Garage	3'-0"
Front Loaded Garage	5'-0"
Residence Front	5'-0"
<u>Rear:</u>	10'-0"
Minimum Distance Between Buildings:	
Garage to Garage	6'-0"
Garage to Residence on Adj. Lot	8'-0"
Residence to Residence	10'-0"
<b>Parking</b>	
Off Street	32 (2 per Lot)
Total Parking with on-street	45
<b><u>Signage</u></b>	<b><u>Number and Dimensions</u></b>
Project Identification	To Be Determined
<b><u>Walls, Fences, Hedges</u></b>	<b><u>Type, Materials, Height</u></b>
North Property Line	To Be Determined
East Property Line	No Fence

South Property Line	To Be Determined
West Property Line	Town Wall
Street and Security Lighting	To Be Determined

**Sheet 2:** Shows the site plan including perimeter boundaries, lot layout, access point, road alignment and typical cross sections and easements throughout the site.

**Sheet 3:** Shows the preliminary grading plan including proposed elevations, floodplain boundaries, inlet and outlet structures, detention pond, and proposed stormwater pipe locations.

**Sheet 4:** Is the preliminary utility plan which shows waterline and sanitary sewer lines.

**Sheet 5:** Is the preliminary landscape plan and illustrates the common open space tracts, typical tree locations, perimeter fence locations, and Town standard wall along Platte Canyon Road.

**Sheet 6:** 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, and a table describing all the tracts with their uses, ownership, maintenance responsibility, and size. Sheet 1 also contains the standard and special notes, and signature blocks and certifications.

**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 area to the north is a commercial shopping center while the areas to the east (Country Club Villas) and south (Village in Columbine Valley) are developed in single family residential. Also east of the site is a vacant lot, the Jurgelonis Property. The area to the west of the site, across Platte Canyon Road, is 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, 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 and The Village in Columbine Valley.

Comments received to date are:

##### **Colorado Department of Transportation (Summary)**

1. To obtain permission to construct utilities, landscaping or any activities within state highway right-of-way, a Utility/Special Use Permit is required.
2. The site plan provided shows a right turn lane will be constructed. With high background traffic this proposal is needed.
3. 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.
4. An overhead light will be required at the site access.

### **Urban Drainage and Flood Control (Summary)**

1. The proposed development lies within the area of the Outfall Systems Planning (OSP) Study for the Town of Columbine Valley, completed in 1985. As defined by the OSP, Drainageway D conveys flows from developments to the west eastward across Platte Canyon Road through the proposed Wilder Commons Development and then through existing development and the Littleton Golf Course to the South Platte River.
2. The design for Wilder Commons must show how Minor and Major (100yr) upstream flows (surface and piped) and onsite flows will be conveyed and routed safely through the development, across the Nevada Ditch and released into the downstream development with no adverse impact.
3. A 4ft x 4ft Culvert is proposed by the OSP to replace the undersized existing 24-inch RCP across Platte Canyon Road. Are there plans to complete these improvements in the future?
4. The proposed easements for the 42-inch Drainageway D pipeline appear to be too narrow. The original OSP recommended a minimum easement width of 35 feet.
5. There is a Zone X Floodplain shown on the plan. Documentation should be provided (i.e. FEMA Firm Panel) for any floodplain delineation on the property.
6. Closed conduits are generally not eligible for UDFCD maintenance assistance. We will however be glad to review surface treatment proposals as the construction documents become available.

### **City of Littleton**

1. If this project were to be developed in Littleton, we would not accept the floodplain delineations (the proposal shows different floodplain limits than the Urban Drainage & Floodplain District has determined). It appears the floodplain on this property may be obstructed by the proposed development and could affect other properties, in Columbine Valley and/or Littleton.
2. We would strongly suggest having the developer extend the Platte Canyon Rd. sidewalk from where it ends, into the development to allow easy access for residents to get to the shopping Center, or other locations.
3. There is a sidewalk on the east side of Platte Canyon Rd., from Bowles Ave. to the property line of the center; it certainly would be advantageous to extend it to the south.

4. The new residents should be made aware of the existing shopping center and the existing day care center which has an open playground adjacent to Lots 5-7. The play area is fenced and buffered but may still generate noise.

### **Xcel Energy**

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

### **Platte Canyon Water and Sanitation District (Summary)**

1. The property is within the District. The District owns and operates the water distribution system and has an agreement with the City of Littleton for sanitary sewer service.
2. The applicant will be required to acquire acceptable easements across adjacent property.
3. Platte Canyon has been in contact with representatives of Wilder Commons and will continue to work with them to determine an acceptable utility plan.

### **Country Club Villas HOA**

1. The left in, left out, from/to Platte Canyon Drive will be difficult, dangerous and an accident potential. Serious study will be required.
2. The "Development Stipulation Chart" states "No Fencing" on the East Property Line. This is unacceptable, The Wilder Commons development must be clearly separated from Country Club Villas and a privacy fence consistent with existing Country Club Villas fencing must be provided to minimize visual and audio cross-feed.
3. The Country Club Villas and all the Brookhaven developments are at a lower elevation than Wilder Commons. The Drainage Plan must clearly address control of any runoff to preclude excessive drainage into these areas. It must verify that the existing 48" storm drain through Country Club Villas is adequate to contain the proposed 48" storm drain from Wilder Commons.
4. The Elevation Plan reflected on Page 6 indicates a design inconsistent with the existing Country Club Villas and Brookhaven developments. The quality and size do not meet the standards set by the existing developments. They appear modular and even pre-fab. This proposed construction would have a definite degrading effect on the existing property values. We would also hope that they are single story. If some

two-story residents are proposed, they should not be adjacent to our property line.

5. The existing vegetation on Country Club Villas property must be protected and maintained.
6. Any disturbance to Country Club Villas property must be repaired and returned to conditions consistent with the Villas integrity.
7. There should be no high level streetlights.
8. There should be a "north boundary" fence bordering the shopping center. It should be substantial to help provide a noise dampening effect.

### **The Village HOA**

Thanks for providing a copy of the preliminary planning for the Wilder Commons development. My concerns and/or observations are as follow:

1. It will be an isolated area of development - cut off from the rest of the Town by the nature of the tract.
2. I feel that it will take a considerable amount of landscape to soften the stark and shocking lines of the proposed homes.
3. Based on current traffic issues along Platte Canyon, this development appears to aggravate an already obvious problem at peak traffic periods.
4. Traffic planning will have challenges. In the Village, we already see peak time flow through traffic as a problem and this will only make it worse.
5. On the positive side, the two developers seem very open to fitting the development into the community in any way possible. They have done an outstanding job of early discussion within the existing community and do seek out suggestions which may avoid later controversy.

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 is still "to be determined". The

plans also show the continuation of the Town wall along South Platte Canyon Road.

**VI. 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 existing and projected impacts are summarized as follows:

<b>Existing and Projected Traffic Volumes</b>	
<b>ADT (Average Daily Trips)</b>	
	<b>Platte Canyon Road</b>
<b>Existing (2012)</b>	<b>16,000</b>
<b>Wilder Commons</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>Build Out</b>	
<b>20 Year Projection</b>	<b>Not Available</b>

The 20 year projection of daily trips for Platte Canyon Road is not available at this time. The Town's traffic consultant is preparing the traffic

impact analysis for Wild Plum Farms and the 20 year projections will be available in that report. In any event the projected 92 daily trips for Wilder Commons will not have a significant impact of the future Platte Canyon volumes.

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

<b><i>AM/PM Peak Hour-Wilder Commons Entry</i></b>	
<b><i>2012 Existing (AM/PM)</i></b>	<b><i>1482/1681</i></b>
<b><i>Wilder Commons</i></b>	<b><i>14/12</i></b>
<b><i>20 Year Projected</i></b>	<b><i>N/A</i></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)</b>	
<b>Wilder Commons Entry</b>	
<b>Existing (2012) AM/PM</b>	<b>D/E</b>
<b>Projected 20 Year AM/PM</b>	<b>N/A</b>

**VII. Report of the Town Engineer**

There is a list of items to be corrected and additional information needed. Most of these are technical issues and it should not be a problem for the applicant to correct the omissions or provide the additional information. The major concerns are:

- A. The Town has not planned to participate in the cost or construction of a 42” RCP to convey flows through the site. In the past, the only projects the town has participated in comply with UDFCD’s maintenance eligibility requirements. This ensures that the town cost shares the project with UDFCD in design and construction as well as limits the Town’s future maintenance responsibilities. As submitted, this application proposes the Town pay for the entirety of the 42” RCP through the subject property. The Town Board of Trustees is the sole authority on that expenditure. The Town Engineer position is to comply with UDFCD’s recommendations.
- B. Subsequent drainage reports will require more detail to prove the developed runoff from the site is compliant with the volumes anticipated for the regional detention pond downstream.
- C. The tract connecting the east side of the property to Nevada Ditch is expected to have many purposes: Utility easements, emergency access, and recreation trail connections. The current width is not adequate to serve these purposes. A 50 foot ROW is required.

D. The proposed improvements along Platte Canyon Road as currently proposed do not adequately address drainage, traffic operations, and safety. Additional design and coordination with Littleton and CDOT is required.

## **VIII Findings**

The staff has reviewed the preliminary development plan and plat, the supporting documents and has conducted a site visit. 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. This property is zoned MUPD (Mixed Use Planned Development) which allows a range of land uses including residential.

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

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 Wilder Commons density (3.9 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 slightly smaller than Country Club Villas and considerably smaller than the Village, ranging from 5,900 to 11,000 S.F. with the average at 7,900 S.F.

#### 2. 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.

#### 3. Development Stipulations.

The Development Stipulations Chart (Sheet 1) is incomplete. The perimeter screening, fences and walls are marked TBD (To Be Determined) as is the block for exterior lighting.

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. There is no question that there will be a visual impact and the applicant should provide the neighboring residents an opportunity to tour some of their existing home sites.

#### **B. Landscaping and Screening**

The landscape plan is illustrative only and indicates screening on the south, east and north property lines. The Plan specifies the Town Wall along the west property line. The applicant and the residents to the south are discussing a privacy fence with the exact design to be determined. There has been no resolution of the treatment along the east and north boundaries. The Country Club Villas HOA has requested a wall along the common property line while the applicant has proposed landscaped screening. While it is acceptable to leave the detailed design of the perimeter treatment to the Final Development Plan, the illustrative concept is to be reviewed with the Preliminary Development Plan. The applicant needs to discuss the fencing and screening issues at the Planning Commission hearing.

#### **C. Traffic Impact, Access and Streets**

1. The impact of 92 VPD (Vehicles Per Day) generated by a built out Wilder Commons would be minimal given that Platte Canyon Road is carrying in excess of 16,000 VPD at present. The critical AM Peak Hour projection is 14 trips with 11 northbound and 3 southbound. The problem with the southbound (left-out) movement in the AM peak hour is that, while possible, it is risky. It is the staff's opinion that the convenience of a left out movement in the AM peak hour **may** not outweigh the risk of an accident and the traffic tie up that could result.

The traffic impact from a built-out Wilder Commons project would have very little impact on the Town's internal streets. The number of projected southbound trips from the project is estimated at 3 in the AM peak hour and 3 in the PM peak. If the entry was restricted to No Left Turn, the effect would likely be a very few vehicles looping back on Middlefield Road in order to access the signal at Fairway and Platte Canyon. If, in the future, access to Middlefield Road is provided through the Jurgelonis property there would be additional traffic on

Middlefield. The amount of the traffic accessing Middlefield could be controlled by internal street design.

2. The applicant is proposing private streets with a 30' foot travel surface as opposed to the public street standard of 36' feet. The standard 50'R-O-W would be provided by right of way easements within the lots. Private streets are permitted but they will not be accepted by the Town for maintenance. Regardless of whether the streets are public or private, the 50' R-O-W is required.

The plan and plat shows Tract C as a 30' easement for utilities trails and open space. The staff feels that full vehicular access to the Jurgelonis property should be provided which will require a minimum 50' width.

#### **D. Drainage**

Both the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District and the Town Engineer have expressed concerns on how the upstream flows from the 100 year event will be conveyed across the site. The proposed 42" pipe will accommodate the 10 year event. In addition Urban Drainage questions the size of the easement shown for the 42" storm sewer. If revisions are required, the size of the detention pond may have to be modified.

#### **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. 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 being spelled out in our detailed review letter to the applicant.

#### **IX. Recommendations**

The approval of the Preliminary Development Plan and Plat is the first step in a two-step process. No building permits can be issued until the Final Development Plan and Final Plat have been approved by the Board of Trustees. The approval of the preliminary plat and plan does, in practice, "lock-in" the proposed use and certain development standards including, the maximum density, maximum height, minimum setbacks, number of access points, street standards and easements dimensions. Items such as detailed

architecture, landscaping and internal street layout can be modified at the time of final plan and plat approval.

The staff is recommending approval of the Preliminary Development Plan and Preliminary Subdivision Plat subject to the following conditions:

**A. Address the concerns of the Town Engineer related to drainage and access design issues.**

**B. Revise the Plan and Plat as follows:**

**Preliminary Development Plan**

**Sheet 1: a. Revise the Standard Notes and Signature Blocks per the letter to the Applicant.**

**b. Revise the Development Stipulations Chart to show the front yard set-backs from the property line.**

**Sheet 2: a. Revise Tract B (drainage easement portion) dimensions as may be required by UDFC specifications. ~~Change Tract #.~~**

**b. Assign a new Tract number to the portion of Tract C that would provide access to the Jugelonis property. Increase the width to 50'.**

**Sheet 3: a. Revise as specified for sheet 2.**

**b. Revise Water Quality Pond to meet UDFC volume requirements, if necessary.**

**c. Change note concerning Zone X to reference documentation.**

**Sheet 4: a. Revise as specified for sheet 2.**

**b. Prior to submittal of the Final Plan/Plat, the off-site water and sewer easements must be obtained.**

**Sheet 5: a. Resolve screening or fencing issue for east boundary.**

**b. Provide specifications as to type and height of walls along north and south boundaries and include typical illustrations.**

**c. Indicate trees to remain and to be removed.**

**Sheet 6: a. Meet with adjacent residents concerning architectural design.**

**B. Revise design per Planning Commission recommendations.**

**Preliminary Plat**

**Sheet 1: a. Revise the Standard and Special Notes and the Signature Blocks per the letter to the Applicant.**

**b. Revise Tract Summary Chart as follows:**

<b>TRACT SUMMARY CHART</b>					
<b>TRACT</b>	<b>AREA (SF)</b>	<b>AREA (AC)</b>	<b>USE</b>	<b>OWNERSHIP</b>	<b>MAINTENANCE</b>
<b>A</b>			<b>ADD "Highway R-O-W"</b>	<b>Town of Columbine Valley</b>	
<b>B</b>			<b>ADD "Highway R-O-W"</b>	<b>Town of Columbine Valley</b>	
<b>C</b>	<b>Revise to delete access to Jurgelonis</b>	<b>Revise to delete access to Jurgelonis</b>			
<b>D</b>					
<b>E</b>					
<b>F</b> <b>New Tract- Access to Jurgelonis</b>	<b>Specify</b>	<b>Specify</b>	<b>Street Access/Open Space/Drainage/Utilities</b>		
<b>Totals</b>	<b>Revise as necessary</b>	<b>Revise as necessary</b>			

**Sheets 2&3: Revise to be consistent with revisions to preliminary Plan.**

