1. CALL TO ORDER

2. GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS
   
   2.I. Approval Of The Minutes From January 8, 2019
   
   Documents:
   
   PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES 01-08-2019.PDF
   
   2.II. Approval Of The Minutes From January 15, 2019
   
   Documents:
   
   PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES 01-15-2019.PDF

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS
   
   3.I. Case No GDP18-005, Quebec & Colorado [Town @ South Of Cherry Creek] / General Development Plan (GDP)
   LOCATION: 7210 E Colorado Ave; 1973-20-4-00-004
   ACREAGE: 6.85 acres
   EXISTING ZONING: R-2
   PROPOSED USE: PUD to allow for a two-story, single-family townhome project
   APPLICANT: Quebec Street Investments LLC on behalf of The More Acres LLC, Owner
   CASE MANAGERS: Kat Hammer, Planner; Kurt Cotton, Engineer
   REQUEST: Positive referral to the Board of County Commissioners
   
   Documents:
   
   ITEM 1 - CASE NO GDP18-005 TOWNS AT SOUTH OF CHERRY CREEK GDP.PDF

   3.II. Case No SDP18-002, Cherry Tree Estates / Specific Development Plan (SDP)
   LOCATION: 1700 S Quebec St; 1973-21-3-00-002
   ACREAGE: 10.65 acres
   EXISTING ZONING: PUD-MU
   PROPOSED USE: 45 single family attached residential units and 7 assisted living (memory care) buildings
   APPLICANT: Kendrick Consulting Inc on behalf of Chadmor Estates LLC, Owner
   CASE MANAGERS: Molly Orkild-Larson, Planner; Sarah L White, Engineer
REQUEST: Approval of the SDP

Documents:

ITEM 2 - CASE NO SDP18-002 CHERRY CREEK ESTATES SDP.PDF

4. STUDY SESSION ITEMS

4.I. Case No LDC19-001, Agricultural Estates (AE) Lot Width Revisions / Land Development Code (LDC)
   PRESENTER: Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager
   REQUEST: Discussion regarding proposed land development code revisions related to lot widths of agricultural estate lots. No formal action to be taken.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

- The next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for February 19, 2019.
- Planning Commission agendas, Board of County Commission agendas, and other important Arapahoe County information may be viewed online at www.arapahoegov.com or you may contact the Planning Division at 720-874-6650.

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Mark Brummel Jamie Wollman Randall Miller
Diane Chaffin Jane Rieck, Chair Richard Sall
Kathryn Latsis

Arapahoe County is committed to making its public meetings accessible to persons with disabilities.
Please contact the Planning Division at 720-874-6650 or TTY 711, at least three (3) days prior to a meeting, should you require special accommodations.
**ATTENDANCE**

A regular meeting of the Arapahoe County Planning Commission was called and held in accordance with the statutes of the State of Colorado and the Arapahoe County Land Development Code. The following Planning Commission members were in attendance:

Mark Brummel; Jane Rieck, Chair; Richard Sall, Kathryn Latsis, Jamie Wollman, and Randall Miller.

Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Asst. County Attorney; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Sarah L. White, Engineer; Kathleen Hammer, Planner II; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; and members of the public.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Rieck called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted a quorum of the Board was present.

**DISCLOSURE MATTERS**

There were no Planning Commission member conflicts with the matters before them.

**GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS:**

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

The motion was made by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Ms. Latsis to accept the minutes from the December 18, 2018 Planning Commission meeting, as amended, to revise ‘address’ to read ‘addressed’ on page 7, paragraph 2.

The motion passed unanimously.

**REGULAR ITEMS:**

**ITEM 1**

Case No. SDPZ18-001, Main Street Villas / Specific Development Plan with Zoning (SDPZ) – Kat Hammer, Planner II, Public Works and Development (PWD)

Ms. Hammer introduced the case and established jurisdiction. She reported the application proposed eight (8) attached residential buildings with a total of sixteen (16) units. She stated the maximum building height proposed was 55 feet; however, staff proposed 35 foot maximum height and three stories. She also recommended a revised condition of approval, specifying that the money for the
sidewalks be provided by the applicant at the time of the Administrative Site Plan (ASP) submittal.

Jennifer Carpenter, LEI Design Group, provided a summary of the proposed housing project, which they believed would be a product for teachers or somebody wanting to downsize. She asked that condition 2, contribution towards the sidewalk, be removed. Ms. Carpenter stated the developer would pay their share at the time the sidewalk was warranted by the County. She explained they followed Section 6-300 of the Land Development Code (LDC) for moderate density where 55’ height or four story height was maximum. She said, while the library intended to purchase the site, they might not, and they didn’t want to have to come back during the ASP process, not knowing what the future design might be.

There were discussions regarding the sidewalk and various options related to delaying payment toward the construction, other sidewalks in the area, how best to ensure the work was completed and possible funding mechanisms. There were discussions concerning the building height maximum, lot sizes in comparison to adjacent subdivisions, the subarea plan, and building heights.

Mr. Haskins reported the applicant had applied for a variance to the curb/gutter/sidewalk and the TRC committee approved the curb and gutter, because of the character around it. He explained that because the proposal was denser, staff wanted to ensure sidewalk money was available; however, if the Planning Commission (PC) determined a sidewalk was an appropriate installation in Byers, they could incorporate that into the conditions of approval. Mr. Haskins stated staff believed having a sidewalk to the future library would be nice to have. He explained normally they would meet with the applicant to discuss, but they haven’t had a chance to do that yet.

Ms. Rieck opened the hearing for public comments. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Ms. Carpenter said Bradbury was willing to pay for the sidewalk when the time came. She explained they got the curb/gutter waived because of nonconforming roadway. She said if they installed the sidewalk now, there might be safety issues. Ms. Carpenter said the applicant would like to put something on the SDP or in an agreement that when the sidewalk did come, they were willing to pay their share for the lot.

It was moved by Ms. Wollman and duly seconded by Mr. Miller, in the case of Case No. SDPZ18-001, Main Street Villas / Specific
Development Plan, that the Planning Commission reviewed the staff report including all exhibits and attachments, listened to the applicant’s presentation and any public comment as presented at the hearing, and moved to recommend approval of the application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns.

2. The developer shall contribute funds for future sidewalk construction, based on a cost estimate of construction.

3. The maximum building height for Lot 1 and Lot 2 shall not exceed 35 feet and be restricted to 3 stories.

4. The development shall meet all Byers Fire District design requirements.

The vote was:

Ms. Rieck, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM 2</th>
<th>Case No PM18-004, Main Street Villas / Minor Subdivision (MS) – Kat Hammer, Planner II, Public Works and Development (PWD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Hammer introduced the case and established jurisdiction for the Planning Commission (PC) to proceed. She provided a brief summary of the project and explained it was a request to replat one lot into two lots. She stated the plat would require sidewalks at the Administrative Site Plan (ASP) process and payment of cash-in-lieu of land dedication. Ms. Hammer said staff was recommending approval with the five conditions listed in the staff report.</td>
<td>Stephanie Stewart, applicant, restated their request to delay sidewalks until the ASP and reminded the PC there was no sunset on how long funds could be held by the County. She directed everyone’s attention to condition 5, which was related to cash-in-lieu amounts. She said they had come up with $6,954.00 for schools, based on Main Street Villas lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Hammer said she would double check the numbers but the County used assumed value method to calculate cash-in-lieu.</td>
<td>Ms. Hammer said she would double check the numbers but the County used assumed value method to calculate cash-in-lieu.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms. Rieck opened the hearing for public comments. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

It was moved by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Ms. Wollman, in the case of Case No. PM18-004, Main Street Villas / Minor Subdivision, that the Planning Commission reviewed the staff report including all exhibits and attachments, listened to the applicant’s presentation and any public comment as presented at the hearing, and moved to recommend approval of the application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns.

2. Approval of PM18-004, Main Street Villas- Minor Subdivision is contingent on the approval of SDPZ18-001, Main Street Villas – Specific Development Plan.

3. The developer will contribute funds for future sidewalk construction, based on a cost estimate of construction.

4. The development shall meet all Byers Fire District design requirements.

5. The applicant shall pay a cash-in-lieu of public land dedication prior to recording of the plat: Schools: $14,805.60, Parks: $5,683.20, and Other Public Purposes: $236.80.

The vote was:

Ms. Rieck, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.

| ADJOURNMENT | There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned. |
**ATTENDANCE**

A regular meeting of the Arapahoe County Planning Commission was called and held in accordance with the statutes of the State of Colorado and the Arapahoe County Land Development Code. The following Planning Commission members were in attendance:

Mark Brummel; Jane Rieck, Chair; Richard Sall, Kathryn Latsis, Jamie Wollman, and Randall Miller.

Also present were: Robert Hill, Senior Asst. County Attorney; Ray Winn, Open Spaces Planner; Roger Harvey, Open Spaces Planning Manager; Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division Manager; Cathleen Valencia, Engineer; Kurtis Cotten, Engineer; Bill Skinner, Senior Planner; Kathleen Hammer, Planner II; Jason Reynolds, Current Planning Program Manager; Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager, and members of the public.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Rieck called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted a quorum of the Board was present.

**DISCLOSURE MATTERS**

There were no Planning Commission member conflicts with the matters before them.

## REGULAR ITEMS:

### ITEM 1

**Case No. LE18-005, Long’s Pine Grove Location and Extent (L&E) – Kathleen Hammer, Planner II, Public Works and Development (PWD)**

Ms. Hammer introduced the application and established jurisdiction for the public hearing. She stated staff was recommending approval with the conditions outlined in the staff report. She introduced Ray Winn, Open Spaces Planner with the Arapahoe County Open Spaces Department, as the applicant for the case.

Mr. Winn presented a PowerPoint, a copy of which was retained for the record. He mentioned studies that preceded the master-planning work for the project. He reported the year-long process shaped the design of the park and included extensive public outreach, traffic studies, and presentation of the proposal to the public at the conclusion of the master planning process. Mr. Winn said a web cast of public meetings was made available and surveys were conducted during meetings. He explained the traffic studies and traffic control...
were planned in conjunction with City and County of Denver to address bicycle and pedestrian safety connecting to the High Line Canal Trail at the bridge at Florida Avenue. He stated a sidewalk through the park would connect the neighborhood on Uinta with the trail, providing a safer alternative to a Florida crossing. Mr. Winn noted privacy fencing and landscaping to address privacy for an adjoining property.

Jessie Clark with Extreme Landscaping and Architecture explained the gateway entry and garden, internal pedestrian circulation, preservation of as many of the existing pine trees on the site as possible while capitalizing on views from the park, a planned turf area for various activities, and a nature-inspired playground. She explained pine trees and pine cones provided the inspiration for the play equipment, which would be low maintenance. She stated a larger picnic area and shelter were planned, along with some individual picnic sites. She said the passive use was well distributed through the park.

Jesse Clark, applicant/consultant, noted ADA parking spaces, horse-trailer parking for equestrian use of the High Line Canal Trail, and water quality facilities for runoff prior to discharging storm water from the site. He said a crusher-fines “soft” interpretive trail was also planned and a restroom facility would be located near the parking lot.

There were discussions regarding parking, ADA, emergency services requirements, and homes within walking distance to the park.

Ms. Rieck opened the hearing for public comments.

Don Andrews, 8151 E. Iowa Dr., had some concerns with the location of the bike path. He put in a berm on his property, which created a grade change. He asked how his trees and property would be protected. He reported having spruce trees on the berm that were 30 to 40 feet tall with an extensive root system that could be damaged with excavation. He also wanted to know the width of the sidewalk and bike path. He stated other neighbors on Iowa were not aware of the sidewalk/bike path.

Marc Paulicelli, 1514 S Uinta Wy., expressed concern with undermining tall trees on adjoining properties that provided character, noise protection, and privacy for nearby properties.
Robert Murphy, 1564 S Uinta Wy., noted an existing sidewalk and asked whether the sidewalk within the park was really necessary. He was also concerned with loss of any trees on the property that provided privacy and screening of the view of the library.

Schuyler Totman, 8080 E Florida Ave., had questions about the grove at the NW corner of the park. He thought Denver Water open space was going to be landscaped to help provide privacy to his home from the new park use.

Mark Lampert, Four Square Mile Neighborhoods Association (4SMNA), noted the 4SM neighborhoods had been asking for additional park space for a number of years. He reported when the owner of the home on the subject property passed away, the County purchased the property from the family. He said 4SMNA envisioned a neighborhood-level park rather than a destination park. He noted some street-crossing and alignment concerns with the roads and an earlier request for a four-way stop sign. He reported Denver had not been willing to widen the bridge on Florida or make improvements in the Denver ROW to improve safety for trail users. Mr. Lampert reported the meandering path through the park to the trail was included as an alternative to having to cross at Florida and to improve overall safety for neighborhood access to the trail. He noted better lights were needed at stop signs for safety. He said people were failing to stop at Uinta and at the trail crossing on the bridge on Florida. Mr. Lampert said parking was important; however, the desire was for this park to be primarily a neighborhood-oriented park for the 4SM residents.

Celeste Nottingham, said she lived across Florida Ave from the proposed park. She reported the flashing crossing sign at the stop sign lit up her living room and bedroom; she did not want to see the lights become brighter or more prominent.

There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Cathy Valencia, Arapahoe County Engineering Services, Engineer, explained some sidewalks were planned in 2020 that were not part of the LE application.

Jesse Clark, Extreme Architecture, answered the question about additional plantings planned for the County property, but noted there were constraints on the Denver Water Board property for enhancing landscaping, in the triangle noted by an adjoining property owner. He offered to follow up with the owner and show him a planting plan.
There were discussions regarding fencing, who would be responsible for maintaining the property, and the plan for sidewalk installation.

It was moved by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Ms. Wollman, in the case of LE18-004, Long’s Pine Grove Open Space / Location and Extent, that the Planning Commission reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, listened to the applicant’s presentation and any public comment as presented at the hearing, and move to approve the application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns.

The vote was:

Ms. Rieck, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis; Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.

**ITEM 2**

Case No. GDP18-004, Copperleaf Parcel J / Preliminary Development Plan 7th Amendment – Bill Skinner, Senior Planner, Public Works and Development (PWD)

Bill Skinner, Senior Planner, introduced the application and noted a date error on the posting form for the sign. He reported having seen the sign on the property.

Mr. Hill asked that the applicant state, for the record, the date of the sign posting and that it had been posted continuously up to the date of today’s hearing.

The applicant confirmed that the sign was posted continuously from December 18, 2018 and that he would correct the posting form for the record and provide it to Mr. Skinner in the morning.

Mr. Skinner explained the changes proposed in building separation distances for Parcel J from 15 feet (approved in 2004) to six feet, did not impact building setbacks from the property line. He said this would be comparable to building separations between parcels (each with a three-foot building setback, adding up to a six-foot separation) that were in place nearby within Copperleaf. He stated the applicant was directed that the change to six feet for building separation would be only for single-family detached homes. Mr. Skinner explained, if
another product type was built in the future, the building separation would continue to be 15 feet.

There were discussions regarding the fire district response occurring during the site plan part of the process, building code issues, and a similar project in Centennial.

Ryan McBreen, Norris Design, as the applicant’s representative, gave some geographic perspective for Parcel J within the Copperleaf development. He confirmed the building separation would apply only for single-family detached housing and the plan set would be updated with that note. He noted this would expand a housing type available within Copperleaf. Mr. McBreen explained the housing type had been around since the Civil War and was not “new” for housing within the U.S. Mr. McBreen explained the types of development, including multi-family and commercial, near the parcel. He reported the applicant felt the housing type was a good addition in the area of the project. He noted Richard Frank, Century Communities, was present to answer questions.

There were discussions regarding building separations with respect to alleyways and setbacks. The Cityscapes project in Centennial was considered. It was noted the homes were similar to townhomes, but were separated by six feet rather than being attached. It was noted the product had been built around the metro area, including Littleton and Centennial.

Ms. Rieck opened the hearing for public comments. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

There were continued discussions regarding density and a comparison of the proposed project to the existing Cityscapes off Broncos Parkway.

Mr. Frank believed there were approximately 140 units total, which was a reduction in previously approved density for the parcel.

**It was moved by Ms. Latsis and duly seconded by Mr. Sall, in the case of GDP18-004, Copperleaf Parcel J / Preliminary Development Plan 7th Amendment, that the Planning Commission reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, listened to the applicant’s presentation and public comment as presented at the hearing, and moved to recommend approval of the application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following condition:**
1. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant will address all Public Works and Development Department Staff comments.

Ms. Rieck, Yes; Mr. Miller, Yes; Mr. Brummel, Yes; Mr. Sall, Yes; Ms. Latsis, Yes; Ms. Wollman, Yes.

| ADJOURNMENT       | There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned. |
LOCATION & VICINITY MAP
The development is located southwest of the intersection of South Quebec Street and East Colorado Avenue. This proposal is located in Commissioner’s District #4.

Location & Zoning of Towns @ South Cherry Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivision</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Subdivision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>R-PM</td>
<td>Single-Family Residence</td>
<td>Oak Park at Cherry Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>I-A, UO-2</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Oak Park at Cherry Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Oak Park at Cherry Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>S-SU-D</td>
<td>Single-Family Residence</td>
<td>West Lynwood No. 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSAL
The applicant, Michael Sullivan on behalf of the property owner, The Mor Acres, LLC/ Jerry T. Moore is proposing a GDP (General Development Plan) to allow for up to 74, 2-story single-family townhomes on 6.85 acres (up to 11.00 dwelling units per acre). The proposal also includes private streets, water quality detention pond and 30% open space.

The GDP is the first step in the three step process. The GDP establishes the general framework for land uses, site layout, development density/intensity, relationship to existing roadways and infrastructure. The second step of approval is of a SDP (Specific Development Plan) consistent with the approved GDP. The third step is approval of an ASP (Administrative Site Plan). The GDP will provide the basis for zoning on this site.

BACKGROUND
The property is zoned R-2 and is currently used for single-family residential. The property is classified as suitable for single family with a density of 1-12 units per acre. If the GDP is approved the new zoning would allow for 2-story townhome product.

NEIGHBORHOOD OUTREACH
The applicant began neighborhood outreach in July of 2018. The applicant connected with various neighbors in the vicinity and held a few meetings between July and September. On October 24th 2018 the applicant held a noticed meeting for all neighbors to the east of the development to discuss the conceptual plans and solicit feedback. The applicant indicated they received positive feedback based on the commitment not to exceed 2 stories. The applicant also presented to the Four Square Mile Neighborhood committee on October 25th 2018 and received suggestions they intend to incorporate into the Specific Development Plan and Administrative Site Plan. A letter with more detail is included as an attachment.

ANALYSIS OF THE GDP APPLICATION
Staff review of this application included a comparison of the proposal to: 1) applicable policies and goals outlined in the Comprehensive Plan; 2) review of pertinent zoning regulations; and 3) analysis of referral comments.

1. Four Square Mile Sub-area Plan/The Comprehensive Plan

Four Square Mile Sub-area Plan - Goal: Limit higher density residential development to arterial (4 lane roads) and major collector streets with greater access to public transit.

    The proposal is located adjacent to a 4 lane road, South Quebec Street. Regional Transit District provides 2 bus routes within ¼ mile walking distance from the proposed site. Route 73 provides transit from the Belleview Station to the Central Park Station. Route 83 provides transit from the Civic Center Station to the Nine Mile Station.

Comprehensive Plan - Policy GM 1.2 - Encourage Infill Development and Redevelopment Arapahoe County will encourage infill development that is compatible with existing land uses in the Urban Area to take advantage of existing public infrastructure and services.
The proposal is located within the Urban Area and is expected to be serviced from existing public infrastructure and services with minimal extensions/adjustments.

Comprehensive Plan - Policy GM 3.1 – Direct Future Development to Areas with Low Risks from Natural and Man-made Hazards

The proposal is located within areas of low risk natural and man-made hazards.

Comprehensive Plan - GOAL PSF 1 – Ensure an Adequate Water Supply in Terms of Quantity and Quality for Existing and Future Development

The proposal will be served by Cherry Creek Valley Water District and Denver Sanitary sewer. The applicant has been working with Cherry Creek Water District for 5-6 months. The Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District is expected to approve the inclusion of this site into the district at the February 21, 2019 scheduled meeting.

Comprehensive Plan - Policy PFS 4.3 - Require Adequate Wastewater Treatment

The proposal will be served by Cherry Creek Valley Water District and Denver Sanitary sewer. The applicant has been working with Cherry Creek Water District for 5-6 months. The Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District is expected to approve the inclusion of this site into the district at the February 21, 2019 scheduled meeting.

Comprehensive Plan - Policy PFS 2.1 – Require Adequate Water Availability for Proposed Development

The proposal will be served by Cherry Creek Valley Water District and Denver Sanitary sewer. The applicant has been working with Cherry Creek Water District for 5-6 months. The Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District is expected to approve the inclusion of this site into the district at the February 21, 2019 scheduled meeting.

Comprehensive Plan - GOAL PFS 6 – Ensure the Adequacy of Electric, Natural Gas, Telephone, Cable and Internet

The proposal will be served by Xcel Energy and Century Link.

Comprehensive Plan - GOAL PFS 7 – Ensure Existing and New Development have Adequate Police and Fire Protection Utilities in Existing and New Development

The Arapahoe County Sheriff did not express concerns about serving the site though they did say that having a traffic signal at East Colorado and Quebec could improve access.

Comprehensive Plan - GOAL PFS 9 – Ensure that the Educational Needs of Existing and New Developments Are Met

The Cherry Creek School District requests cash-in-lieu using the Assumed Value Method at the time of Final Plat to provide adequate educational needs for the new development.

Comprehensive Plan - GOAL NL 1 – Create Livable Mixed Use Neighborhoods in Designated Growth Areas
The proposal will provide housing diversity in the Urban Growth Area and Four Square Mile neighborhood.

Comprehensive Plan - Policy NL 1.2 - Encourage Mixed Use Neighborhoods that Are Served by a Multi-modal Transportation System

The proposal will provide residential uses located near two bus routes.

Comprehensive Plan - Policy NL 1.3 - Encourage Higher Density Development in New Neighborhoods within the Urban Area

The site is suitable for up to 12 units per acre per the Four Square Mile Sub-area Plan. The proposal anticipates a maximum of 11.00 units per acre.

2. Land Development Code Review

Section 13-106 of the Land Development Code allows GDP to be approved if the proposal meets all of the following criteria:

a. It generally conforms to the Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan; and

The Four Square Mile Sub-Area Plan designates this property as “Single Family, 1-12 dwelling units per acre.” The proposed GDP is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan/Four Square Mile Sub-Area Plan.

b. It complies with the standards for conventional rezoning pursuant to Section 13-201; and

13-201.01 Recognize the limitations of existing and planned infrastructure, by thoroughly examining the availability and capability of water, sewer, drainage, and transportation systems to serve present and future land uses.

The site will be served by Cherry Creek Water, Xcel Energy and CenturyLink. Xcel and CenturyLink had no major concerns and their requested easements can be dedicated through the platting and site planning processes. The proposal includes a detention pond to meet drainage requirements and is within close proximity to public transit.

13-201.02 Assure compatibility between the proposed development, surrounding land uses, and the natural environment.

The proposal is compatible with the existing environment. The proposed design standards and the maximum building height help achieve compatibility with the single family detached neighborhood to the west of the site.

13-201.03 Allow for the efficient and adequate provision of public services. Applicable public services include, but are not limited to, police, fire, school, park, and libraries.

The proposal will be served by police, fire, school, park and libraries.
13-201.04 Enhance convenience for the present and future residents of Arapahoe County by ensuring that appropriate supporting activities, such as employment, housing, leisure-time, and retail centers are in close proximity to one another.

The proposal is within close proximity to employment, retail centers and open space. The Cherry Creek trail is one block to the north, and two City of Denver Parks are ¼ to ½ mile away (Cook Park and City of Chennai Park).

13-201.05 Ensure that public health and safety is adequately protected against natural and man-made hazards which include, but are not limited to, traffic noise, water pollution, airport hazards, and flooding.

The public health and safety is adequately protected from traffic noise, water pollution and flooding. The site is not in close proximity to an airport.

13-201.06 Provide for accessibility within the proposed development, and between the development and existing adjacent uses. Adequate on-site interior traffic circulation, public transit, pedestrian avenues, parking and thoroughfare connections are all factors to be examined when determining the accessibility of a site.

The proposal includes an internal private drive and internal sidewalk that connect to existing infrastructure. The site is in close proximity to public transit. The proposed parking standards will also provide more parking than is required by Arapahoe County code.

13-201.07 Minimize disruption to existing physiographic features, including vegetation, streams, lakes, soil types and other relevant topographical elements.

The proposal will minimize disruption to existing physiographic features.

13-201.08 Ensure that the amenities provided adequately enhance the quality of life in the area, by creating a comfortable and aesthetically enjoyable environment through conventions such as, the preservation of mountain views, the creation of landscaped open areas, and the establishment of recreational activities.

The proposal is expected to create a comfortable and aesthetically enjoyable environment.

13-201.09 Enhance the useable open spaces in Arapahoe County, and provide sufficient unobstructed open space and recreational area to accommodate a project’s residents and employees.

The proposal includes open space to accommodate residential development.

13-201.10 Ensure the application complies with the requirements of this Resolution and the Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan.

The application complies with the Land Development Code and the Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan.

c. It represents an improvement in quality over the strict application of the otherwise applicable zone district or development standards in this LDC, including but not limited to open space and access; environmental protection; vegetative preservation; efficiency in
transportation systems and connectivity; alternative transportation options; improvements in utilities and services; or innovative housing or employment centers; and

The proposal represents an improvement in quality from the strict standards of the Land Development Code. The application is consistent with the density in the Four Square Mile Sub-area Plan. The proposal includes adequate open space, pedestrian connections to public sidewalks and public transit, privacy fencing and a diversity of housing in the area.

d. It is consistent with the purpose of the Planned Unit Development District as stated in Section 13-101 of this LDC; and

The proposal is consistent with the PUD purpose and the proposed amendment appears to satisfy the Arapahoe County Zoning Regulations and procedures as stated in Section 13-101 of the LDC.

e. Any modifications to the standards and requirements of this LDC are warranted by the layout and design of the site, amenities incorporated into the development plan, or by the need to protect or avoid unique site features; and

The proposed modifications to the standards and requirements of the LDC are warranted by layout and design of the site, open space and diversity in housing in the area.

f. The proposed plan meets the applicable standards of this LDC, unless varied by the PUD.

The proposal meets the applicable standards of the LDC.

In addition to the above criteria the, a GDP must also meet the following criteria:

a. The proposed land uses, development densities/intensities, and building heights will not create significant adverse impacts on surrounding properties; and

The density and height of the proposal will not create significant adverse impacts on the surrounding properties.

b. It demonstrates an efficient use of land that facilitates a more economic arrangement of buildings, vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems and utilities; and

The proposal demonstrates the efficient use of land while providing higher density, pedestrian connectivity and access to existing services.

c. It provides efficient street and trail connectivity to existing adjacent development that generally conforms with the Comprehensive Plan; and
The proposal provides internal sidewalk connection to existing infrastructure, including the Cherry Creek trail, one block to the north.

d. It provides or expands access to existing open space, and preserves and protects natural features; and

The proposal provides open space. The site does not have any existing natural features.

e. It includes efficient general layouts for major water, sewer, and storm drainage areas.

The proposal will be served by Cherry Creek Water and the details will be provided at the time of SDP.

3. REFERRAL COMMENTS

Comments received during the referral process are as follows*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Agency</th>
<th>Referral Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY AGENCIES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY ASSESSOR</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY ASSESSOR-COMMERCIAL</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY ASSISTANT ATTORNEY</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY COMMUNITY RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY OPEN SPACE</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY PWD MAPPING</td>
<td>See plan set for comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY PWD PLANNING</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY PWD WEED CONTROL</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY PWD/ ZONING</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIZEN ORG &amp; HOA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT-UACED</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENCON</td>
<td>Concerns about adequate parking for residents, guests, deliveries, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENVER SOUTH ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUR SQUARE MILE AREA</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH METRO FIRE</td>
<td>Approved application subject to water distribution plans, hydrant placement will be submitted under a separate application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLOODPLAIN/WETLANDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/Agency</td>
<td>Referral Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN DRAINAGE</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH DEPARTMENT/AIR QUALITY</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRI COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT-REFERRALS</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOA</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DORA-HOA OFFICE</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBRARY</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE LIBRARY DISTRICT-REFERRALS</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL GOV MAILING LIST</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRCOG-DENVER REGIONAL COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARK &amp; RECREATION</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE PARK &amp; RECREATION DISTRICT</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANNING OFFICES</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AURORA PLANNING - REFERRALS</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENVER PLANNING SERVICES-CPD</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST OFFICE</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POST OFFICE - ARAPAHOE COUNTY</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOLS</td>
<td>Cash-in-lieu requirements. SEE LETTER FROM DAVID STROHFUS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHERRY CREEK SCHOOL DISTRICT 5-REFERRALS</td>
<td>Additional parking and access would be of assistance for both emergency and non-emergency public safety response. Suggest a light controlled intersection onto Quebec St. SEE LETTER FROM GLENN THOMPSON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHERIFF</td>
<td>No comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY SHERIFF</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY SHERIFF/COMMUNITY RESOURCES</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY SHERIFF/CRIME PREVENTION UNIT</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARAPAHOE COUNTY SHERIFF/PATROL REFERRALS</td>
<td>Additional parking and access would be of assistance for both emergency and non-emergency public safety response. Suggest a light controlled intersection onto Quebec St. SEE LETTER FROM GLENN THOMPSON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td>Additional parking and access would be of assistance for both emergency and non-emergency public safety response. Suggest a light controlled intersection onto Quebec St. SEE LETTER FROM GLENN THOMPSON.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD</td>
<td>There is an existing bus stop far side of the proposed Jewell access. This stop will need to meet ADA requirements. SEE LETTER FROM SCOTT WOODRUFF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTILITIES OR PHONE</td>
<td>Century Link will have to have easements granted and/or use existing easements. SEE LETTER FROM KAREN CAIME.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTURYLINK NETWORK REAL ESTATE DEPARTMENT</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**STAFF FINDINGS**

Staff has visited the site, reviewed the plans, supporting documentation, referral comments, and citizen input in response to this application. Based upon review of applicable policies and goals in the Comprehensive Plan, review of the development regulations and analysis of referral comments, our findings include:

1. Staff finds that the proposed GDP18-005, Towns @ South of Cherry Creek General Development Plan generally conforms to the Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan (Byers Sub-area Plan).

2. The proposed GDP18-005, Towns @ South of Cherry Creek General Development Plan meets the Arapahoe County Zoning Regulations and procedures, including Section 13, Planned Unit Development.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Considering the findings and other information provided herein, Staff recommends approval of case number GDP18-005, Towns @ South of Cherry Creek General Development Plan subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns.

2. The applicant will need to provide will serve letters from Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District and the City and County of Denver.

*(Draft motions provided on next page)*
DRAFT MOTIONS

Recommend Conditional Approval

In the case GDP18-005, Towns @ South of Cherry Creek General Development Plan, the Planning Commissioners have reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, and have listened to the applicant’s presentation and the public comment as presented at the public hearing. I hereby move to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of this application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns.

2. The applicant will need to provide will serve letters from Cherry Creek Valley Water and Sanitation District and the City and County of Denver.

Staff provides the following Draft Motions as guidance in preparing an alternative motion if the Planning Commission reaches a different determination:

Recommend Denial:

In the case of case GDP18-005, Towns @ South of Cherry Creek General Development Plan, the Planning Commissioners have reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, and have listened to the applicant’s presentation and the public comment as presented at the public hearing. I hereby move to RECOMMEND DENIAL of this application based on the findings:

1. State new or amended findings in support of denial as part of the motion.

2.

Continue to Date Certain:

In the case of GDP18-005, Towns @ South of Cherry Creek General Development Plan, I move to continue the hearing to [date], 6:30 p.m., to obtain additional information and to further consider the information presented.

Attachments:
Application & Exhibits
Referral Comments
### Public Works and Development
- **Address:** 6924 S. Lima Street, Centennial, Colorado 80112
- **Phone:** 720-874-8650
- **Website:** www.arapahoe.gov

### Land Development Application
- **Form must be complete**
- **Land Development Application materials received after 2pm shall be date stamped received the following working day.**

#### Applicant/Representative:
- **Name:** Michael Sullivan
- **Title:** President

#### Owner(s) of Record:
- **Name:** Jerry T. Moore
- **Title:** Manager

#### Engineering Firm:
- **Contact Person:** Michael Moore

#### Pre-Submittal Planner:
- **Name:** Kat Hammer

#### Pre-Submittal Engineer:
- **Name:** Kurtis Cotten

#### Parcel AIN No.:
- **Type in Parcel AIN No. in the next box without dashes in between:**
- **Address:** PO Box 16390, Boulder, Colorado 80308
- **Phone:** (303) 449-1887
- **Fax:** (303) 449-2960

#### Parcel Address or Cross Streets:
- 7210 E. Colorado Ave

#### Subdivision Name & Filing No.:
- Towns @ South of Cherry Creek

#### Related Case Numbers:
- Preliminary/Final Development Plan, Rezoning, and/or Plat
- Q18-053

### Existing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case/Project/Subdivision</td>
<td>Towns @ South of Cherry Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Area (Acres)</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density (W/dwelling Units/Acre)</td>
<td>10.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Square Footage</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Disturbed Area (Acres):
- General Development Plan of Major Amendment [ ]
- Master Development Plan or Major Amendment [ ]
- Specific Development Plan or Major Amendment [ ]
- Planned Sign Program or Major Amendment [ ]
- Vacation of Right of Way/Easement/Plat [ ]
- 1041 - Areas & Activities of State Interest - Use by Special Review [ ]
- Comprehensive Plan [ ]

### Case Type (Administrative Case types are shaded in Gray)
- Location & Extent or Major Amendment [ ]
- Administrative Site Plan [ ]
- Administrative Amendment to (CUP, SLP, etc) [ ]
- Administrative Replat [ ]
- Final Plat [ ]
- Land Development Code Amendment [ ]
- Administrative Replat [ ]
- Commercial Mobile Radio Service (CMRS/cellular antennas) [ ]
- Subdivision Exemption [ ]
- Use by Special Review - Oil and Gas [ ]
- Use by Special Review - Oil and Gas [ ]
- Special District Title 30 [ ]
- Title 32 [ ]
- Special District Title 30 [ ]
- Special District Title 32 [ ]
- Administrative Oil & Gas Use by Special Review (AOGUSR) [ ]
- Replat (Major) [ ]
- Rural Cluster [ ]
- Street Name Change [ ]

### THIS SECTION FOR OFFICE USE ONLY
- **Case No.:** Q18-053
- **Planning Manager:** Kat
- **Engineering Manager:** Kurtis
- **Planning Fee:** 0 N $2,500
- **Engineering Fee:** 0 N $6,073
- **TCHD Fee:** 0 N $0

This application shall be submitted with all applicable application fees. Submit of this application does not establish a vested property right in accordance with C.R.S. 24-88-105(1). Processing and review of this application may require the submission of additional information, subsequent reviews, and/or meetings, as outlined in the Arapahoe County Land Development Code.
October 3, 2018

Arapahoe County Public Works & Development
Planning Division
6924 S. Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112

RE: Letter of Intent: Towns @ South of Cherry Creek
Case Number Q18-053

Dear Public Works & Development:

We are pleased to propose the above-referenced project, on behalf of the property owner, The More Acres LLC/Jerry T. Moore, within unincorporated Arapahoe County. The project is located at 7210 E. Colorado Avenue, Denver, at the intersection of S. Quebec Street and E. Colorado Avenue (APN 1973-20-4-00-004). The project includes 6.85 gross acres and is currently zoned R-2 with a land use designated as Residential SF (1-12 units per acre). The proposed mapping would create 21 buildings comprised of 74 townhome lots.

The applicant and design team has endeavored to respond to every comment we received at our pre-submittal meeting on 4-18-2018, as well as to perform ongoing community outreach to hear from the community. We are proposing a single-family townhome product that is well within the density range of the Four Square Mile Sub-Area Plan and under the maximum (proposed 10.98 instead of 12 units per acre).

As such, we are proposing a rezoning to a PUD under this General Development Plan Application that would allow for 2-story townhome product, private streets, water quality detention pond, and 30% of the site area to be open space (likely maintained by a Metro District). We are currently studying early comments we received from the community indicating that some Denver residents to our west may prefer to see the E Colorado Ave intersection as EVA only. We would value staff feedback on this concept.

We very much look forward to delivering a high-quality townhome development at this location that will add value in the community. We thank you in advance for your review of this project and look forward to working with staff and the community as we move forward. In the meantime, please do not hesitate to contact us should you have any questions or concerns at 408-802-3110 or mike@srecompany.com.

Sincerely,

Michael Sullivan
President

Enclosures:
- GDP Plans (Harris Kocher Smith)
- Submittal Checklist
- Development Application Form
- Title Commitment
- Notarized Letter of Authorization
- Phase 1 Drainage Study
- Traffic Impact Study
- Application Fees
Planning Commission Summary Report

Date: February 5, 2019

To: Arapahoe County Planning Commission

Through: Kat Hammer
Planning Division, Case Planner

From: Kurt Cotten, PE
Engineering Services Division, Case Engineer

Case name: GDP18-005 – Quebec and Colorado

Purpose and Recommendation
The purpose of this report is to communicate the Engineering Staff findings, comments, and recommendations regarding the land use application identified above.

Engineering Staff has reviewed the land use application and has the following findings:

1. The project proposes to rezone a 6.85 acre site to allow for 2-story townhome product, private streets, water quality detention pond, and 30% open space.

2. The applicant is working with Arapahoe County and Southeast Metro Stormwater Authority to ensure the site will meet all stormwater requirements.

3. The applicant will be granting any necessary ROW and constructing curb, gutter, and sidewalk along the south side of E Colorado Ave in accordance with Arapahoe County’s requirements. It is also anticipated that the applicant will add two feet to the existing sidewalk along S Quebec Street to make it ten feet total in width.

4. A traffic engineer has conducted a traffic study for the proposed development. The traffic study recommends no modifications to the S Quebec St/E Colorado Ave intersection, stop control on the proposed west leg of the intersection of S Quebec St and E Jewell Ave with no modifications to the east, north and south legs, no changes as a result of this development to S Quebec St and E Cherry Creek South Dr, and the E Colorado Ave/Proposed Site Access intersection will be widened to match the road to the west and will have stop control on the site access. A signal warrant analysis was also conducted on the S Quebec St/E Jewell Ave intersection and it was determined that a traffic signal will not be warranted. The engineering services division has reviewed the traffic study and signal warrant analysis and found it to be acceptable with no comments being made.

Engineering Staff is recommending the land use application(s) favorably subject to the following conditions:

1. Applicant addresses all Arapahoe County Engineering Services Division comments.
2. Applicant obtains all necessary approvals and permits.
3. Applicant enters into an SIA and provides collateral to the County for all public improvements associated with the project.
The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. The proposed project includes 6.85 gross acres and is currently zoned R-2 with land use designated as Residential SF (1-12 units per acre). The proposed project would create 21 buildings comprised of 74 townhome lots. The applicant is specifically proposing a rezoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) under this General Development Plan (GDP) to allow for 2-story townhome product, private streets, water quality detention pond and 30% of the site area to be open space.

Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

| COMMENTS: |
| I Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted |
| I Have the following comments to make related to the case: |

| ORGANIZATION & SIGNATURE |
| □ I Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted |
| □ I Have the following comments to make related to the case: |

Comments:
CenturyLink
5025 N. Black Canyon Hwy
Phoenix, AZ 85015

October 22, 2018

Kat Hammer, Arapahoe County Planner II
Arapahoe Public Works & Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial CO, 80112
khammer@arapahoegov.com

RE: GDP 18-005
Case Name: Quebec & Colorado – Towns at South of Cherry Creek
APN: 1973-20-4-00-004
Owner: The Mor Acres, LLC

Dear Ms. Hammer:

Qwest Corporation d/b/a CenturyLink QC has reviewed the General Development Plan to Rezone to allow for 2-Story Townhomes. CenturyLink’s Field Engineer Andy Devine has reviewed the General Development Plan and has determined that as the project progresses CenturyLink will have to have easements granted and/or use existing easements. CenturyLink does currently have facilities and pedestals in the parcels to be developed. If the developer wishes to have those facilities relocated, the developer will need to contact Andy Devine at 720-578-5141 or andy.devine@centurylink.com.

If you have any questions, please contact Lisa Gallegos-Thompson, CP at 406-443-0583.

Respectfully,

Karen Caime

Karen Caime
Network Real Estate
Karen.Caime@centurylink.com
P809137
October 11, 2018

Ms. Kat Hammer
Arapahoe County Public Works & Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112

Subject: Towns @ South of Cherry Creek
Case Number: Q18-053
Proposed Townhome Development – 74 units

To Whom it May Concern:

Cherry Creek School District No. 5 has reviewed the information provided by Arapahoe County regarding the specific development plan for the Towns @ South of Cherry Creek project and will provide educational services to the future residents of this project. Students from this project are within the current boundaries of Eastridge Elementary School, Prairie Middle School, and Overland High School. Boundaries are subject to change when necessary to promote the efficient utilization of school facilities.

Utilizing the Arapahoe County Land Development Code, the land dedication calculation for the school district would be 0.7003 acres or an appropriate cash-in-lieu fee. The student generation worksheet is included below.

---

Cherry Creek School District #5
Planning Department

Student Generation Worksheet - Arapahoe County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name:</th>
<th>Towns at South of Cherry Creek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developer/Contact Person:</td>
<td>SRE Development Co. &amp; The More Acres LLC/Jerry T. Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted for Review:</td>
<td>10/11/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Acreage:</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Dwelling Units:</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Units/Acre</td>
<td>10.8029197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres per child</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Density</th>
<th>#D.U.s</th>
<th>Student Generation per DU</th>
<th>Students Generated</th>
<th>Land Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0 - 7.49 du/ac</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.5 - 14.99 du/ac</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.700336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00 or more du/ac</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.7003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In this instance, the district believes that the Assumed Value Method that is commonly used to determine cash-in-lieu requirements will result in an amount that is far less than the fair market value of this property. In order to fairly evaluate the cash-in-lieu fee, the district's intent is to utilize the Appraisal Method to determine the fair market value as outlined in the Arapahoe County Land Development Code 14-111.05.02 B.1.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal. Should you need additional information from Cherry Creek Schools, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

David Strohfas,
Director of Planning and Interagency Relations

Cc: David Hart – Chief Operating Officer
    David Henderson – Director of Educational Support Services
The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. The proposed project includes 6.85 gross acres and is currently zoned R-2 with land use designated as Residential SF (1-12 units per acre). The proposed project would create 21 buildings comprised of 74 townhome lots. The applicant is specifically proposing a rezoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) under this General Development Plan (GDP) to allow for 2-story townhome product, private streets, water quality detention pond and 30% of the site area to be open space.

Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS:</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION &amp; SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ I Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ I Have the following comments to make related to the case:</td>
<td>Jeff Sceili – Plan Reviewer SMFR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Water distribution system to include the number and placement of fire hydrants has not been addressed. Application is disapproved.
The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. The proposed project includes 6.85 gross acres and is currently zoned R-2 with land use designated as Residential SF (1-12 units per acre). The proposed project would create 21 buildings comprised of 74 townhome lots. The applicant is specifically proposing a rezoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) under this General Development Plan (GDP) to allow for 2-story townhome product, private streets, water quality detention pond and 30% of the site area to be open space.

Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

Comments: As I read them the plan set shows 27 parking spots. Not sure if the townhomes have their own parking but additional parking and access would be of assistance for both emergency and non-emergency public safety response. The plans also show a left turn out onto Quebec St. which would create a traffic safety issue unless it was at a light controlled intersection.
The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. The proposed project includes 6.85 gross acres and is currently zoned R-2 with land use designated as Residential SF (1-12 units per acre). The proposed project would create 21 buildings comprised of 74 townhome lots. The applicant is specifically proposing a rezoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) under this General Development Plan (GDP) to allow for 2-story townhome product, private streets, water quality detention pond and 30% of the site area to be open space.

Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS:</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION &amp; SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ I Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ I Have the following comments to make related to the case:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. The proposed project includes 6.85 gross acres and is currently zoned R-2 with land use designated as Residential SF (1-12 units per acre). The proposed project would create 21 buildings comprised of 74 townhome lots. The applicant is specifically proposing a rezoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) under this General Development Plan (GDP) to allow for 2-story townhome product, private streets, water quality detention pond and 30% of the site area to be open space.

Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS:</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION &amp; SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ I Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted</td>
<td>/s/Nathan Fogg, Office of Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ I Have the following comments to make related to the case:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. The proposed project includes 6.85 gross acres and is currently zoned R-2 with land use designated as Residential SF (1-12 units per acre). The proposed project would create 21 buildings comprised of 74 townhome lots. The applicant is specifically proposing a rezoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) under this General Development Plan (GDP) to allow for 2-story townhome product, private streets, water quality detention pond and 30% of the site area to be open space.

Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

Comments: There is an existing bus stop far side of the proposed access at Jewell. This stop will need to meet ADA requirements max grade perpendicular to the flow line of 2%. This stop should meet The RTD guidelines included in this response.
Molly Orklid-Larsen
Arapahoe County Planner II
Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
Arapahoe County Lima Plaza
6924 S. Lima Street,
Centennial CO, 80112
720-874-6666

File #/Name: GDP18-005
Project Type: General Development Plan
Referral Received: October 10, 2018
Comments Due: November 5, 2018

S. Metro Review #: REFOTH18-00170
Plan Reviewer: Jeff Sceili  jeff.sceili@southmetro.org
Review Date: October 15, 2018

**Narrative:**

Code Reference: 2015 IFC/IBC

South Metro Fire Rescue's Fire Marshal's Office has reviewed the above referenced project and has **Disapproved** this application as water distribution plans, to include number and hydrant placement has not been addressed.
Greetings.................
Thank you for contacting Denver South EDP.
We have no comments on this project.

Thanks,
Lynn

Lynn Myers
Senior Vice President
Denver South Economic Development Partnership
304 Inverness Way South, Suite 315
Englewood, CO 80112
(303) 531-8385
C: (303) 884-2496

Good Morning,

Please use the link below to view documents in regard to a proposed project located southwest of the intersection of East Colorado Avenue and S Quebec Street. The proposed project includes 6.85 gross acres and is currently zoned R-2 with land use designated as Residential SF (1-12 units per acre). The proposed project would create 21 buildings comprised of 74 townhome lots. The applicant is specifically proposing a rezoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) under this General Development Plan (GDP) to allow for 2-story townhome product, private streets, water quality detention pond and 30% of the site area to be open space.

Link to access application documents:
http://pwms.co.arapahoe.co.us/citizenaccess/urlrouting.ashx?type=1000&Module=Planning&capID1=18CAP&capID2=0000&capID3=00589&agencycode=Arapahoe
Be sure to return the attached External Referral Routing Sheet with a signature and indication of who the comments are from. The deadline is November 5, 2018.

Contact me directly with any questions or concerns or if you have issues accessing the documents.

Thanks,

Kat Hammer
Arapahoe County Planner II

Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial CO, 80112
Planning Department: 720.874.6666
khammer@arapahoegov.com

Arapahoe County Public Works and Development Website
The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. The proposed project includes 6.85 gross acres and is currently zoned R-2 with land use designated as Residential SF (1-12 units per acre). The proposed project would create 21 buildings comprised of 74 townhome lots. The applicant is specifically proposing a rezoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) under this General Development Plan (GDP) to allow for 2-story townhome product, private streets, water quality detention pond and 30% of the site area to be open space.

Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS:</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION &amp; SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️ I Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted</td>
<td>Rich Bordchardt, UDFCD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐️ I Have the following comments to make related to the case:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

We have no comments on this project as it is not eligible for UDFCD maintenance. The site is under 130 acres and does not include any proposed UDFCD Master Plan improvements.
November 5, 2018

Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112

Attn: Kat Hammer

Re: Towns at South Cherry Creek, Case # GDP18-005

Public Service Company of Colorado’s (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the plans for Towns at South Cherry Creek. For future planning, and to ensure that adequate utility easements are available within this development and per state statutes, PSCo requests that 6-foot wide dry utility easements are dedicated for natural gas facilities along the side of the lots where there is space for service truck access, typically on the “alley” side of each lot. Eight-foot (8) wide dry utility easements are requested for electric facilities including space for transformers, pedestals, and cabling, which typically reside in the landscaped areas on the “front” side of each lot.

Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing intermediate pressure natural gas distribution facilities along South Quebec Street and requests that they are shown on the plans.

The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities via FastApp-Fax-Email-USPS (go to: https://www.xcelenergy.com/start, stop, transfer/new construction service activation for builders). It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. Additional easements may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the Utility Notification Center at 1-800-922-1987 to have all utilities located prior to any construction.

Should there be any questions with this referral response, please contact me at 303-571-3306 or donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com.

Donna George
Right of Way and Permits
Public Service Company of Colorado
Kathleen Hammer

From: Raymond Winn  
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 10:25 AM  
To: Kathleen Hammer; Roger Harvey  
Subject: RE: Arapahoe Co Referral - GDP18-005 - DUE NOVEMBER 5

Follow Up Flag: Follow up  
Flag Status: Flagged

Kat,

Open Spaces will request the appraisal method to be used in determining cash-in-lieu for providing parks and open space.

While the development is in close proximity to the Cherry Creek trail it is essential that the developer keep the existing 8' detached sidewalk on South Quebec. If the developer wishes to expand the sidewalk to 12’ Open Spaces would deduct this cost from the Cash-in-Lieu calculation.

Sincerely,

Ray Winn

Cheyenne-Arapahoe and Long’s Pine Grove Parks  
Planning and design: https://4squaremileparks.com/

Open Spaces Planner  
Arapahoe County Open Spaces  
6934 S. Lima Street, Suite A,  
Centennial, CO 80112  
Office: 720-874-6551  
rwinn@arapahoegov.com

---

From: Kathleen Hammer <KHammer@arapahoegov.com>  
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 12:05 PM  
To: Raymond Winn <RWinn@arapahoegov.com>; Roger Harvey <RHarvey@arapahoegov.com>  
Subject: FW: Arapahoe Co Referral - GDP18-005 - DUE NOVEMBER 5

Good Afternoon,

I do not believe I received a referral response for this case from Open Spaces. Will you please review and provide me with any comments are your earliest convenience. The case is scheduled for hearing on February 5th at PC.
Good Morning,

Please use the link below to view documents in regard to a proposed project located southwest of the intersection of East Colorado Avenue and S Quebec Street. The proposed project includes 6.85 gross acres and is currently zoned R-2 with land use designated as Residential SF (1-12 units per acre). The proposed project would create 21 buildings comprised of 74 townhome lots. The applicant is specifically proposing a rezoning to a Planned Unit Development (PUD) under this General Development Plan (GDP) to allow for 2-story townhome product, private streets, water quality detention pond and 30% of the site area to be open space.

Link to access application documents:
http://pwms.co.arapahoe.co.us/citizenaccess/urlrouting.ashx?type=1000&Module=Planning&capID1=18CAP&capID2=0000&capID3=00589&agencycode=Arapahoe

Be sure to return the attached External Referral Routing Sheet with a signature and indication of who the comments are from. The deadline is November 5, 2018.

Contact me directly with any questions or concerns or if you have issues accessing the documents.

Thanks,

Kat Hammer
Arapahoe County Planner II

Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial CO, 80112
Planning Department: 720.874.6666
khammer@arapahoegov.com

Arapahoe County Public Works and Development Website
QUEBEC & COLORADO
GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN

SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 20 AND THE NORTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 29, TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH,
RANGE 67 WEST OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE, STATE OF COLORADO

CALL 3 BUSINESS DAYS IN ADVANCE BEFORE YOU DIG, GRADE, OR EXCAVATE FOR THE MARKING OF UNDERGROUND MEMBER UTILITIES.

PRIVATE STREET MAINTENANCE:

PRIVATE STREET MAINTENANCE SHOULDN'T AFFECT THE PUBLIC STREET PLAN OR CONTRACTS UNLESS AGREED TO BY THE CITY OF ARAPAHOE. IT'S IMPORTANT TO KEEP THE CITY INFORMED OF ANY AND ALL CHANGES TO STREET AND SUBDIVISIONS. CONTACT THE CITY FOR ANY AND ALL QUESTIONS REGARDING STREET MAINTENANCE.

LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE:

THE CITY AND COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE RESERVE THE RIGHT TO REQUEST ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTATION OR INFORMATION TO SUPPORT THE APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT. ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS MAY BE REQUIRED TO SUPPORT THE APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT.

SHEET INDEX:

Sheet Number | Sheet Title
-------------|-------------
1 | COVER SHEET
2 | GDP PLAN

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:


THE measurement is awarded according to the plans and specifications furnished by the owner.

DEVELOPER: Godden | Sudik ARCHITECT: CIVIL ENGINEER / PLAN PREPARE: HKS, INC.
ARAPAHOE COUNTY LAND DEVELOPMENT CODES

PRINCIPAL LAND USES PERMITTED
- SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING UNIT
- TYPE A GROUP HOME
- SINGLE FAMILY ATTACHED UNIT

UNIT Sep. Distance
- NO MINIMUM

MINIMUM OPEN SPACE
- N/A
- 30%

MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT
- 25' OR TWO STORIES
- 30'

SETBACKS
- 25' FRONT YARD - PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE
- 25' REAR YARD - PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE; 10'
- ACCESSORY STRUCTURE
- 15' SIDE YARD - PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE; 5'
- ACCESSORY STRUCTURE

20' SETBACK TO THE SOUTH PROPERTY BOUNDARY
10' SETBACK TO THE NORTH PROPERTY BOUNDARY
15' SETBACK TO THE WEST AND EAST PROPERTY BOUNDARIES
5' FROM ADJACENT CURBS OR BACK OF WALK, WHICHEVER IS CLOSER (EXCLUDING ALLEYS)

W/ ATTACHED WALKS - 15' FRONT TO HOUSE, 10' TO PORCH
W/ DETACHED WALKS - 13' FRONT TO HOUSE, 9' TO PORCH

15' MIN. BUILDING SEPARATION

LOT WIDTH MINIMUM
- 75'
- NO MINIMUM (SEE NOTE 2)

MINIMUM LOT AREA
- 20,000 SQ. FT.
- NO MINIMUM (SEE NOTE 2)

PARKING
- REQUIRED - 167 SPACES TOTAL
- PROVIDED - 175 SPACES TOTAL

(required - 2 SPACES/DU, 0.25 GUEST SPACES/DU)
LOCATION:
The Cherry Tree Estates development is adjacent to Cherry Creek trail corridor, east of S. Quebec Street and northeast of Cherry Creek Drive South Drive. The 10.65 acre property is zoned MU-PUD and surrounded by the City and County of Denver. It is also situated in Commissioner District No. 4.
ADJACENT SUBDIVISIONS, ZONING, AND LAND USES:
North: Immediately north is the Chennai Park and Concha Townhouses located in the City and County of Denver. The zoning is Open Space-Public Parks (OS-A) and Planned Unit Development (PUD), respectively.

South: Cherry Creek corridor located within the City and County of Denver and zoned Open Space-Conservation (OS-C).

West: Granville West townhome development and is located within the City and County of Denver. The zoning is Residential (R-2-A).

East: Single family residential located within the City and County of Denver, zoned R-3 PUD.

PROPOSAL:
This application proposes a Specific Development Plan (SDP) for a residential community for individuals 55 years of age or older needing assistance in one or more daily life activities due to handicaps that limit their capacities to care for themselves (assisted living-memory care) and residential housing for independent seniors. This development will have 52 dwelling units: seven residential units for assisted living and 45 single-family attached residential (SFA) units for independent seniors.

This subject parcel is divided into two development areas, Planning Areas 1 and 2. These areas are separated by a 75’ wide overhead electric transmission easement.

The assisted living will be housed in a residence and contain a kitchen, one to two living areas, and bedrooms to accommodate up to 16 residents, as specified on the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP). The assisted living residence is “A residential facility that makes available to three (3) or more persons, not related to the owner of such facility, either directly or indirectly through a resident agreement with the resident, room and board and at least the following services: personal services; protective oversight; social care due to impaired capacity to live independently; and regular supervision that shall be available on a twenty-four (24) hour basis, but not to the extent that regular twenty-four (24) hour medical or nursing care is required as defined under CCR 1011-1.” (Arapahoe County Land Development Code, Chapter 19: Definitions)

Each single-family attached unit will have a garage and patio for the senior residents.

Planning Area 1:
Planning Area 1 is 4.829 acres in size and proposes 10 dwelling units with a density of 2.07 dwelling units per acre (du/ac). The dwelling units will consists of six assisted living and four single-family attached residences for seniors living independently.
The height of the residential buildings in Planning Area 1 will be one story, 19’ and 21’-6” in height for the SFA and assisted living, respectively.

Planning Area 2:
Planning Area 2 is 5.827 acres and proposes 42 dwelling units with a maximum density of 7.21 du/ac. One assisted living residence, 41 single-family attached units for independent seniors, a club house and maintenance shed are proposed in this planning area. The club house may contain an office, kitchen facilities and gathering area for social activities and events.

The heights of the SFA and assisted living residences are the same as in Planning Area 1. The club house is two-stories, 28’-6” in height and the shed will be approximately 13’ tall.

This development proposes a total of 52 dwelling units with a gross maximum density of 4.88 du/ac which complies with and is less than the 53 dwelling units and gross maximum density of 4.97 du/ac approved under the PDP. Both Planning Areas comply with the heights set by the PDP which are: Planning Area 1 – maximum 32’; and Planning Area 2 – 38’ maximum for SFA and assisted living and 32’ maximum for the club house.

Deciding Body:
For SDPs that have an established zone district, the Planning Commission is the deciding body for the application.

RECOMMENDATION:
Staff: Staff recommends the application be approved based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval outlined herein.

I. BACKGROUND
On April 26, 2016, the Board of County Commissioners approved a PDP (Z16-001) which rezoned the subject parcel from A-2 to MU-PUD and 53 dwelling units (assisted living and single family attached).

A Minor Subdivision is concurrently being reviewed with this SDP. The purpose of this platting process is to create a legal lot for the proposed development.

II. DISCUSSION
Staff review of this application included a comparison of the proposal to: 1) applicable policies and goals outlined in the Comprehensive Plan; 2) review of pertinent zoning regulations; and 3) analysis of referral comments.
1. The Comprehensive Plan
The Comprehensive Plan’s Four Square Mile Subarea Plan designates this site as Urban Residential (1-12 du/ac) and Potential Park/Open Space.

Urban Residential primary uses include: detached single-family dwellings, single-family attached (duplex, triplex, four-plex, townhouse, row houses), and small multi-family dwelling units. Secondary uses include: neighborhood commercial centers, parks and recreation facilities, places of worship, and schools, both public and private. The development density is one to 12 dwelling units per gross acre. The density of this development is 4.88 du/ac which meets the density specified for Urban Residential.

This application complies with the following Goals and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan:

- Policy GM 1.1 – Direct Growth to the Urban Area
  The proposed development is to be located in the Urban Area.

- Policy GM 1.2 – Encourage Infill Development and Redevelopment
  The proposed application is located in the Urban Area and has access to existing public facilities.

- Goal PFS 1 – Ensure an Adequate Water Supply in Terms of Quantity and Quality for Existing and Future Development.
  Water for the proposed facility is available.

- Policy PFS 4.3 – Require Adequate Wastewater Treatment
  The facility will be connecting to an existing public sewer.

- Goal PFS 6 – Ensure the Adequacy of Electric, Natural Gas, Telephone, Cable and Internet Utilities in Existing and new Development.
  The proposed development is in an Urban Area and has access to all the utilities mentioned above.

- Goal PFS 7 – Ensure Existing and New Development have Adequate Police and Fire Protection
  The proposed development will have adequate fire and police service.

- Goal NL 5 – Develop a Countywide Open Space, Parks and Trails System
  The applicant is supporting a trail system by proposing to connect to the public trail along Cherry Creek corridor.
2. **Land Development Code (LDC) Review**

Chapter 13-106.01, Planned Unit Development (PUD) of the LDC, provides approval criteria for all PUD applications. In addition to those criteria, a PUD rezoning (GDP or SDP) also must meet all the applicable criteria in Sections 13-106.02 and 13-106.03.

13-106.01

A. It generally conforms to the Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan.

   *As noted in the previous section, the proposed development conforms to the Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan by proposing development in the designated Urban Area of the County that contains existing roads and utilities. The proposed density also generally conforms to the Urban Residential designation in the Four Square Mile Sub-Area Plan.*

B. It complies with the standards for conventional rezoning pursuant to Section 13-201 (*each subsection is discussed in more detail below)*:

13-201.01

Recognize the limitations of existing and planned infrastructure, by thoroughly examining the availability and capability of water, sewer, drainage, and transportation systems to serve present and future land uses. 

*The proposed infrastructure is adequate to support the proposed use. Existing roads will provide access for residents and visitors traveling to and from the site. A “will serve” letter was received from the water and wastewater provider stating that this district can serve the development.*

13-201.02

Assure compatibility between the proposed development, surrounding land uses, and the natural environment.

*The proposed one-story development is anticipated to blend with the development in the area through building style and materials. One-story residential units rather two-story will assist in preserving views of the mountains for surrounding developments to the north and east of the subject property.*

13-201.03

Allow for the efficient and adequate provision of public services. Applicable public services include, but are not limited to, police, fire, school, park, and libraries.

*The proposal can be served by existing public services.*
13-201.04
Enhance convenience for the present and future residents of Arapahoe County by ensuring that appropriate supporting activities, such as employment, housing, leisure-time, and retail centers are in close proximity to one another. The proposed development will provide employment opportunities and housing types (independent senior and assisted living housing) that are in demand in the Denver area.

13-201.05
Ensure that public health and safety is adequately protected against natural and man-made hazards which include, but are not limited to, traffic noise, water pollution, airport hazards, and flooding. The subject property was a former landfill. The applicant removed all debris in 2017 under the supervision of Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE). CDPHE has issued a No Action Determination letter stating that there is no evidence of contamination on-site which exceeds State standards or poses any risk to human health or the environment.

A portion of the roads of the development are within the 100-year floodplain. Floodplain permits will be required for roadway construction and issued by the City and County of Denver.

The subject development is not within Airport Influence Area and the Colorado Geological Survey has reviewed the application and doesn’t have any objections with the project.

13-201.06
Provide for accessibility within the proposed development, and between the development and existing adjacent uses. Adequate on-site interior traffic circulation, public transit, pedestrian avenues, parking and thoroughfare connections are all factors to be examined when determining the accessibility of a site. A private road provides a loop through the development and has two points of access at S. Quebec Street and E. Colorado Avenue. Both entrances will be gated and will be accessible to both the sheriff and fire district.

The parking for the assisted living units (guest, employee and visiting service providers) is located adjacent to the buildings. The SFA units will have parking in each of the unit’s garages and driveways. The guest parking for SFA is located on the outer edges of Planning Area 2 making it less convenient for those visiting the development’s residents; the applicant is aware of this staff concern, but feels this layout best meets the needs of the overall development.
At SDP, the applicant is to show access points to arterials and collector streets. The development’s access points are located in the City and County of Denver and the City will therefore be responsible for approving all right-of-way access locations and permits for this project. Final access approval will need to be provided to the County prior to the final approval of the Administrative Site Plan and Minor Subdivision plat.

A proposed trail along the Cherry Creek corridor will be adjacent to the development. This trail will provide pedestrian access between S. Quebec Street and E. Colorado Avenue and will be a recreation amenity to those living in Cherry Creek Estates and the surrounding community.

As per Section 12-1207.C of the Land Development Code, an applicant may submit a request for a reduction in parking requirements to the Planning Manager and the Planning Manager may allow reductions up to 10% of total required parking through an administrative land use process. In a Parking Analysis Memo dated November 30, 2018, the applicant requests a reduction in total parking spaces from the required 172 to 167. Based on the information and analysis in the memo, the Planning Manager approved the parking reduction request. See attached approval letter.

13-201.07
Minimize disruption to existing physiographic features, including vegetation, streams, lakes, soil types, and other relevant topographical elements. No significant physiographic features exist on this site. Cherry Creek is located immediately south of the site and the applicant has no plans to disrupt the stream channel.

13-201.08
Ensure that the amenities provided adequately enhance the quality of life in the area, by creating a comfortable and aesthetically enjoyable environment through conventions such as, the preservation of mountain views, the creation of landscaped open areas, and the establishment of recreational activities. The subject site is located adjacent to the Cherry Creek Trail corridor. The Cherry Creek Trail is part of the Denver Urban Area network of trails and connects directly too many of the area’s significant bike/pedestrian trail corridors as well as regional park facilities.

The applicant proposes single-story residential instead of two- or three-story units. This will assist in preserving mountain views for surrounding homeowners.
13-201.09
Enhance the useable open spaces in Arapahoe County, and provide sufficient unobstructed open space and recreational area to accommodate a project’s residents and employees.
Planning Area 1 will have 42% open space and Planning Area 2 will have 37%. Both exceed the minimum percent open space proposed in the PDP, which is 35% for both Planning Areas 1 and 2.

13-201.10
Ensure the application complies with the requirements of this Resolution and the Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan.
As discussed in the Comprehensive Plan section, the proposed development complies with the Comprehensive Plan by proposing a development within designated Urban Area of the County that has existing roads and utilities. The applicant is also promoting and supporting the trail systems by connecting the development with the Cherry Creek Trail. The development also complies with the Four Square Mile Sub-Area Plan Urban Residential land use designation.

C. It represents an improvement in quality over the strict application of the otherwise applicable zone district or development standards in this LDC, including but not limited to open space and access; environmental protection; vegetative preservation; efficiency in transportation systems and connectivity; alternative transportation options; improvements in utilities and services; or innovative housing or employment centers.
The application proposes a development that upholds the PDP standards. The applicant proposes to exceed the minimum open space approved by the PDP. The applicant also proposes a type of housing development that is desirable and in need in the area.

D. It is consistent with the purpose of the Planned Unit Development District as stated in Section 13-101 of this LDC.
This application promotes a design concept that mixes assisted living and housing for independent seniors. The development consists of one-story residential which assists in preserving views of the mountains.

E. Any modifications to the standards and requirements of this LDC are warranted by the layout and design of the site, amenities incorporated into the development plan, or by the need to protect or avoid unique site features. The proposed development doesn’t alter the Cherry Creek corridor.

F. The proposed plan meets the applicable standards of this LDC, unless varied by the PUD.
The proposed plan meets applicable standards with the exception of the maximum allowable pole height for lighting. The Land Development Code
specifies for residential lighting be 20’ in parking areas and 15’ in all other areas. The applicant is proposing a 21’-6” tall light pole. Staff has set a condition of approval for the applicant to work with staff at ASP to ensure that lighting meets the intent of the code, particularly with respect to a pedestrian-oriented development where good lighting is important.

In addition to meeting the approval criteria for all PUD applications (13-106.01), an SDP in the three-step process must also comply with the development standards and requirements of the approved GDP for the site (13-106.03). The SDP functions similarly to a GDP in that it identifies the land uses and zoning requirements and standards. The SDP also provides more detail on the project by proposing the site layout of the development, general landscaping and other site details as appropriate.

The proposed Specific Development Plan meets PUD development standards by exceeding the minimum open space requirement set in the PDP, promoting trail connection and proposing a needed housing type in the Denver area. The applicant has also been responsive to neighborhood comments and has designed a project that is less than the full density approved in the PDP and has buildings with lower maximum building heights than approved in the PDP.

This property has been difficult to market and develop in the past due to lack of direct street access for the lot, former use of the property as a landfill requiring remediation, and a major power line corridor transecting the site. The applicant has worked out access to two public streets through negotiations and pending permits with the City and County of Denver. He has also remediated the old landfill/dumping issues and received clearance from CDPHE. The proposal is for a use that is compatible with the adjoining residential uses and public park in Denver and the adjoining Cherry Creek Trail corridor, providing an economic use for this challenged site.

The proposal efficiently uses the now developable land on the property. County staff and affected referral agencies have evaluated the accessibility of the proposal and determined it provides adequate on-site circulation. The proposed development connects to an existing street network and includes sidewalks providing pedestrian access to the Cherry Creek Trail.

Development of the site also provides an opportunity for much-needed funding for the off-site Cherry Creek project, which also accommodates a need for pedestrian access between Colorado Avenue and Quebec Street. The funding for the trail is in lieu of accommodating a pedestrian connection on site due to the need for gating this community for safety and privacy of its special-needs residents.

3. Referral Comments
Comments received during the referral process are as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referral Agency</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County Engineering Services Division</td>
<td>Staff is working with the applicant to address all engineering and SEMSWA comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County Building</td>
<td>Requests that the applicant adhere to all County Building codes and design criteria. <em>The applicant is willing to comply with this request.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County Mapping</td>
<td>Staff is working with the applicant to address all comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County Zoning</td>
<td>Staff is working with the applicant to address all comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County Open Spaces</td>
<td>County Open Spaces is requesting the applicant pay a cash-in-lieu amount of $90,000 to build the portion of the Cherry Creek Trail adjacent to the development’s property. <em>The applicant has agreed to this cash-in-lieu amount. Cash-in-lieu will be addressed and collected with the Minor Subdivision plat which is running concurrently with this SDP. Cash-in-lieu funds must then be allocated to the project by the County through an established process.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County Sheriff</td>
<td>This agency had the following requests: 1) ensure that there are adequate methods of emergency access to the gated community; 2) addresses be clearly visible on the buildings and homes from the street; 3) development needs to be well lit; and, 4) provide secure mailboxes that are lit; 5) signage for the development be visible from roads. <em>Applicant is willing to work this agency. Staff would note that the applicant would need to work with City and County of Denver on placement of a sign at the access point at time of ASP. Staff has set a condition for these items to be addressed.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County – Weed Control</td>
<td>No comments received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County Assessor</td>
<td>No comments received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County Library District</td>
<td>No concerns with this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County Post Office</td>
<td>No comments received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Geologic Survey</td>
<td>The site does not contain, nor is it exposed to, any geologic hazards or geotechnical constraints that would precluded the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County of Denver</td>
<td>No comments received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Metro Fire Rescue</td>
<td>This agency had the following comments: Project will need to meet fire apparatus access, water and hydrant spacing, overhead power lines apparatus clearance, and signage and stripping of fire lanes requirements. Identify gates and fence locations and sidewalks for Building A1 and provide clarification of Tract C15 Emergency Access. <em>The applicant is working with the fire district in addressing their comments. Staff has set a condition that these items be addressed.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Creek School District</td>
<td>It is understood that this development is for seniors and there are no children, therefore no cash-in-lieu fees are required. However, if this development changes to allow children, the school reserves the right to request cash-in-lieu fees. <em>Staff set this as a condition of approval.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-County Health Department</td>
<td>The applicant has worked with CDPHE and cleaned up the landfill that existed on the property. CDPHE has issued a letter stating that there is no evidence of contamination and there is no risk to human health or to the environment. This agency commends the applicant for proposing housing that addresses the needs of aging adults and proposing seven-foot walkways along the main development driveways. This agency encourages the applicant to consider all sidewalks through the development to be a minimum of five feet, which is typical of active senior communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Square Mile Neighborhood</td>
<td>The neighborhood group appreciates the time and effort that the applicant has put into this development. The applicant presented at the Four Square Neighborhood Meeting on July 17, 2018. The applicant explained that the buildings in Planning Area 1 had been reduced from two-story to one and reduced the number of SFA units from 43 approved by the PDP to 42 units. The applicant also explained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that each entrance will be gated and a pedestrian trail will be situated adjacent to their development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Arapahoe Conservation District</th>
<th>No comments received.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTD</td>
<td>This agency requests that the applicant coordinate with RTD to relocate the existing bus stop since it will not meet the RTD requirements for offset from intersections. The applicant is willing to work with this agency. Staff will set a condition of approval requiring that the applicant work with the City and County of Denver and RTD to establish a new location for the RDT stop on S. Quebec Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CenturyLink</td>
<td>If CenturyLink facilities are found to restrict development the applicant will relocate the facilities at the applicant’s expense and within the CenturyLink guidelines. All relocations will be done under the supervision of a CenturyLink Inspector. The applicant is willing to work with CenturyLink.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xcel Energy</td>
<td>This agency requested that the applicant add a note addressing easements for dry utilities on the property. A tract table will be placed on the plat identifying the easement type, use of easement, who the easement is granted to and who maintains the easement surface. This agency requests that all utility easements be depicted on the plat. This request will be addressed on the plat. This agency requested and received from the applicant an Encroachment Easement needed for development occurring within the 75’ wide overhead power transmission easement. After review of this document, more information on the lighting layout, access, and trickle channel need to be provided. Staff has reviewed with the project engineer the access to the towers, the ability of vehicular travel over the trickle channel and lighting locations. The SDP is more general, and these items will be further reviewed with the ASP, which is more detailed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corp of Engineers</td>
<td>No comments received.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Creek Valley Water &amp; Sanitation District</td>
<td>Need to meet the regulations of this District and provided a letter stating they can provide the property with water and sanitary sewer service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The applicant is working with this district to meet their requirements.

Southeast Metro Stormwater Authority (SEMSWA)

See engineering comments above.

Urban Drainage

This agency indicates that part of the road is within Cherry Creek Floodplain and local permits are required. The applicant will need to obtain a floodplain permit from the City and County of Denver at the time of the Administrative Site Plan. Staff has made this a condition of approval. This agency also states the project does not have any items that need UDFCD maintenance.

Concha Townhome Association

No comments received.

Granville West HOA

No comments received.

Public Comment: Several emails were received by staff from one individual inquiring about the Planned Unit Development review process required for this project, why there are access discrepancies between the access depiction on the PDP, SDP, ASP and Denver Access Permit for Quebec Street, proposed landscape along the Concha fence line and construction schedule of the development, and wanting assurance that construction hours will be reasonable and weekend work prohibited.

Staff Response to Public Comment:

PUD Review

Staff explained that under the PUD review process the applicant would be required to go through the Site Development Plan and Administrative Site Plan review processes. No General Development Plan (GDP) would be necessary since the applicant received approval of a Preliminary Development Plan in 2016, which is equivalent to a GDP. It was also explained that a Minor Subdivision plat would be required.

Access

The access depicted on the PDP, SDP and ASP differ from the Denver Access Permit. The purpose of the PDP and SDP access points are to show how the development’s road can possibly connect to S. Quebec Street and E. Colorado Avenue. However, the approved access points by the City and County of Denver will need to be depicted on the ASP. The ASP will not be approved without right-of-way location and access permits from the City and County of Denver.
Landscaping
The SDP landscape plan is conceptual and is to show the locations of trees, shrubs, landscape buffers and screening. After reviewing the initial submittal, staff recommended that the applicant add more trees and shrubs, especially along the Concha property to provide a better buffer between these developments. A condition of approval has been set for the applicant to provide adequate screening between the proposed development and the Concha townhomes.

Construction Schedule
The Land Development Code doesn’t specify how quickly a project should be built or specify the days or hours of construction. However, the applicant could agree to specific hours of construction consistent with City and County of Denver restrictions.

Four Square Mile Neighborhood Meeting: The applicant presented at the Four Square Neighborhood Meeting on July 17, 2018. There were no objections to this project at the meeting.

Neighborhood Meetings: On projects that could possibly be of public interest, staff encourages the applicant to host a neighborhood meeting. The applicant did not conduct any meetings with the adjacent Concha Townhome Association or Granville West Homeowner Association. Although, the applicant has been in touch with both associations.

The applicant responded to an email sent by the Concha HOA requesting the applicant to address four items. Below lists these requests followed by the applicant’s response shown in italics.

1. Develop a joint operating agreement regarding the maintenance of the fence between our properties. The applicant is willing to enter into a maintenance agreement for the shared fence between the developments.

2. Provide compensation to Concha homeowners to purchase a couple of trees for their backyards in order to provide a visual buffer between the developments. The applicant is not interested in paying for trees off-site since landscaping is proposed between the development’s units and the Concha townhomes.

3. Development should have start and end dates for construction. Establishing a date certain for construction for this development is not possible due to the complexity of the site, State and County regulations and County review processes.

4. Add a traffic light at E. Iowa Avenue to address traffic concerns. No traffic signal has been recommended by the City and County of Denver or County.
The request by the Concha Townhome Association for the maintenance of the fence can be addressed through a private agreement. The provision of additional plants between the developments has been made a condition of approval and shall be addressed on the landscape plan during the Administrative Site Plan review. The other two requests for a traffic signal and setting construction start and end dates are not within the control of the applicant.

**STAFF FINDINGS:**
Staff has visited the site and reviewed the plans, supporting documentation, referral comments, and citizen input in response to this application. Based on the review of applicable policies and goals, as set forth in the Comprehensive Plan, review of the development regulations, and analysis of referral comments, our findings include:

**Specific Development Plan**
1. The proposed Specific Development Plan conforms to the overall goals and intent of the Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan in regards to the policies set forth in those plans.

2. The proposed Specific Development Plan is consistent with development standards enumerated in the Arapahoe County Land Development Code.

3. The proposed Specific Development Plan complies with the process and requirements outlined in Section 13-100 Planned Unit Development (PUD) of the Arapahoe County Land Development Code.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
Considering the findings and other information provided herein, staff recommends approval of Case No. SDP18-002 Cherry Tree Estates - Specific Development Plan, with conditions recommended in this report.

**DRAFT MOTIONS:**
In the case of SDP18-002 Cherry Tree Estates - Specific Development Plan, the Planning Commissioners have reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, and have listened to the applicant’s presentation and the public comment as presented at the public hearing. I hereby move to APPROVE this application based on the findings in the staff report, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature of the final copy of these plans, the applicant must address Public Works Staff comments and concerns.

2. At the time of the Administrative Site Plan, the applicant shall work with the City and County of Denver and RTD to locate a new RTD stop along S. Quebec Street.
3. The applicant shall address all fire district’s comments.

4. All right-of-way access and location permits from the City and County of Denver shall be obtained prior to approval of the Administrative Site Plan and Minor Subdivision.

5. At the Administrative Site Plan, the applicant shall address all the sheriff’s requests, including working with the City and County of Denver on placement of a visible sign at street entrances.

6. Applicant shall work with staff at Administrative Site Plan to ensure that lighting meets the intent of the code, particularly with respect to a pedestrian-oriented development where good lighting is important.

7. At the Administrative Site Plan, the applicant shall provide adequate screening along the boundary with the Concha development.

8. If this development changes to allow children, the school district reserves the right to request cash-in-lieu fees.

9. Cash-in-lieu fees to be paid prior to the recording of the Minor Subdivision plat.

10. The Site Development Plan and Administrative Site Plan approvals are conditioned on the final approval of the associated Minor Subdivision plat.

Alternate Motions:
The following motions are provided as alternatives to the recommended motion for Conditional Approval:

DENY: In the case of SDP18-002 Cherry Tree Estates - Specific Development Plan, the Planning Commissioners have reviewed the staff report, including all exhibits and attachments, and have listened to the applicant’s presentation and the public comment as presented at the public hearing. I hereby move to DENY this application based on the findings:

   a. State new or amended findings in support of denial as part of the motion.

   b. …

CONTINUE TO DATE CERTAIN:
In the case of SDP18-002 Cherry Tree Estates - Specific Development Plan, I move to continue the public hearing to (DATE), date certain, 6:30 p.m., in the Arapahoe Room at 6954 S. Lima Street, Centennial, Colorado 80112, to receive additional information and to further consider information presented.
**Attachments:**
Application & Exhibits
Engineering Staff Report
Referral Comments
Supporting Material
**Land Development Application**

Form must be complete

Land Development Application materials received after 2pm shall be date stamped received the following working day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT/REPRESENTATIVE</th>
<th>ADDRESS: 727 Geneva St. Aurora, CO 80010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Kendrick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONE: (303) 725-1255 FAX:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL: <a href="mailto:kendrickplanning@gmail.com">kendrickplanning@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OWNER(S) OF RECORD</th>
<th>ADDRESS: P.O. Box 857 Pine, CO 80470</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim Van Meter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONE: (303) 888-5459 FAX:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL: <a href="mailto:vanmeter_tj@msn.com">vanmeter_tj@msn.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGINEERING FIRM:</th>
<th>ADDRESS: 7853 E. Arapahoe Court Suite 2500, Centennial, CO 80112</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roth Lang Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONE: (303) 841-9355 FAX:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL: <a href="mailto:kevinroth@rothlang.com">kevinroth@rothlang.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATED CASE NUMBERS</th>
<th>EXISTING</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning:  PUD: Mixed Use</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Area (Acres): 10.656 acres</td>
<td>10.656 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floor Area Ratio (FAR): 50%</td>
<td>Maximum 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Density (Dwelling Units/Acre): 4.98 du/acre</td>
<td>4.98 du/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Square Footage: n/a</td>
<td>Maximum 1.924 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CASE TYPE** (Administrative Case types are shaded in Gray)

- General Development Plan or Major Amendment
- Master Development Plan or Major Amendment
- Specific Development Plan or Major Amendment
- Planned Sign Program or Major Amendment
- Rezoning - Conventional
- Use by Special Review - Oil and Gas
- Vacation of Right of Way/Easement/Plat
- 1041 - Areas & Activities of State Interest - Use by Special Review
- Comprehensive Plan
- Rural Cluster
- Special District Title 30
- Title 32

**THIS SECTION FOR OFFICE USE ONLY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No:</th>
<th>Planning Manager:</th>
<th>Engineering Manager:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Fee:</th>
<th>Y N $</th>
<th>Engineering Fee:</th>
<th>Y N $</th>
<th>TCHD Fee?: \</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This application shall be submitted with all applicable application fees. Submitting this application does not establish a vested property right in accordance with C.R.S. 24-58-105(1). Processing and review of this application may require the submittal of additional information, subsequent reviews, or meetings, as outlined in the Arapahoe County Land Development Code.
June 21, 2018

Arapahoe County Planning
6924 S. Lima St
Centennial, CO  80112

RE: Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan and Minor Subdivision

To Whom It May Concern;

On behalf of the property owner, Tim VanMeter of Cherry Tree Estates LLC, we are submitting two applications for the project named Cherry Tree Estates. The site is located off of Quebec Street at South Cherry Creek. The project was rezoned by the County in 2016 to PUD Mixed Use through a preliminary development plan (PDP) allowing assisted living residences (ALR), single family attached (SFA) and detached residences in two (2) planning areas. Cherry Tree Estates was zoned to be a residential community that provides housing for persons 55 years of age or older including those needing assistance in one or more daily life activities. The project is 10.65 acres in size.

The owners are submitting a two-part request, a minor subdivision plat to establish one (1) lot and a Specific Development Plan (SDP) in order to allow 52 of the 53 dwelling units approved on the PDP. The SDP proposes 10 dwelling units in the north half (Planning Area 1) and 42 dwelling units in south half (Planning Area 2) complying with the PDP. The 10 dwelling units in PA 1 will include six (6) ALR and four (4) SFA dwelling units. Forty-two (42) dwelling units are proposed in PA 2 consisting of 41 SFA dwelling units and one (1) ALR. Consequently, the project is slightly under the allowed density.

The proposed buildings are in compliance with the intent of the architectural character described in the PDP document and are similar or superior to the surrounding neighborhoods. The buildings have largely brick facades with corner stones, cornices and dentil molding. There are numerous changes in the building massing including the roof design and there are no unobstructed walls that do not include window openings or bay windows.

The building heights are also under the allowed maximum elevations per the approved PDP. The ALR buildings are single story proposing a maximum of 22 feet where 32 feet is allowed with two (2) stories. The SFA are 20 feet and single story where 38 feet are allowed and three (3)
stories in height. There is a clubhouse which is 28 and a half feet tall. Over-all the project is significantly under the maximum building heights allowed through the PDP.

The residential neighborhood is gated on the western end off of Quebec Street and on the east end off of Colorado Avenue. The project proposes a wrought iron fence along the southern and western boundaries with intermittent brick pillars along the full length. The northern boundary has an existing wood fence and no changes are proposed with this fence. The eastern boundary has a new six-foot wood fence that was constructed by the owner for the Granville West subdivision. The proposed parking is in compliance with the requirements of the Arapahoe County code for Assisted Living Residence and Single Family Attached Housing and in fact exceed the code by a couple of spaces.

The project is not required to provide an internal pedestrian circulation system through the site because the City Denver, Denver Water, SEMSWA and Arapahoe County have a joint project underway to reconstruct the Cherry Creek including the trail along the southern boundary of this property. While the owner will not be building a trail, he is required to contribute to the Public Park land dedications as part of this project and a cash-in-lieu contribution will be made with the platting of this property.

We look forward to your review of these two applications and the next phase of this development.

Sincerely,

Melissa Kendrick
Kendrick Consulting Inc.

Cc: Tim VanMeter, Owner
Kevin Roth, Roth Lang Engineering Group
Planning Commission
Engineering Summary Report

Date: January 14, 2019

To: Arapahoe County Planning Commissioners

Via: Molly Orkild-Larson
Planning Division

From: Sarah White
Engineering Services Division

Cc: Chuck Haskins, Engineering Services Division, Division Manager
Case File

Re: Cherry Tree Estates
SDP18-002 / Specific Development Plan (SDP)

Purpose and Recommendation
The purpose of this report is to provide the Engineering Services Division Staff findings, comments, and recommendations regarding the above-referenced land use application(s).

Scope/Location:
Melissa Kendrick of Kendrick Consulting, on behalf of the property owner, Tim Van Meter, is requesting approval of the Specific Development Plans for Cherry Tree Estates. The 10.65 acre parcel is located at 1700 S Quebec St, near the intersection of East Cherry Creek South Drive and South Quebec Street. The site lies within the Cherry Creek drainage basin.

The project proposes preliminary site planning for 52 dwelling units including 10 assisted living facilities and 42 attached single family dwelling units, a clubhouse and storage unit.

Items included with this referral:
Specific Development Plan
Traffic Impact Study- update
Phase II Drainage Study
Engineering Services Division Staff (Staff) has reviewed the above-referenced land use application(s) and has the following findings and comments:

List applicable comments and findings

1. This parcel is in the __________ Cherry Creek __________ drainage basin.
2. This development lies within the boundaries of the Southeast Metro Stormwater Authority (SEMSWA).
3. This development lies within the boundaries of the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (UDFCD).
4. This development lies adjacent to Cherry Creek and the City and County of Denver.
5. This development will require a Subdivision Improvement Agreement (SIA) to guarantee on site and off site public improvements at time of Administrative Site Plan (ASP).
6. Right-of-Way (ROW) adjacent to this development is within the City and County of Denver.
7. All ROW access locations and permits are approved by Denver. Denver access permit (TEP) final approval to be provided to County, prior to final lot platting and ASP.
8. Engineering review and approval fees have been paid.
9. The 2013 Flood Hazard Area Delineation (FHAD) for Cherry Creek is currently in process. The tentative FHAD completion is estimated for effective date July 2019. A separate Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) is being processed for the channel improvements within Cherry Creek by Muller Engineering and UDFCD. The CLOMR is based off floodplain delineation from the FHAD. The existing Floodplain Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) has both access inundated during a major flooding event. The FIRM was not an engineering studied map. Existing contours do not follow the proposed floodplain delineation. The FHAD removes both access drives from the 100 year floodplain. The CLOMR delineation represents the most accurate delineation. The Technical Review Committee (TRC) has approved the CLOMR as the regulatory floodplain for this project. Elevation Certificates will be required for building certificate of occupancy. Lowest floor (including basement) shall have a 2 foot freeboard above 100 year water surface elevation.
10. The following variances have been requested/granted:
   - Use of CLOMR for floodplain delineation.

Engineering Services Division Staff is recommending this land use application favorably subject to the following conditions:

List Conditions of Approval

1. The applicant agrees to address the Division of Engineering Services’ comments and concerns as identified within this report.
December 26, 2018

Melissa Kendrick
Kendrick Consulting, Inc.
Delivered by email: kendrickplanning@gmail.com

RE: SDP18-002 Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan – Administrative Parking Reduction Approval

The Arapahoe County Land Development Code, Section 12-1200 Parking, 12-1207 General Provisions, C. Parking Reduction Request, states: *As part of a land use application, the applicant may submit a request for a reduction in parking requirements to the Planning Manager. The Planning Manager may allow reductions up to 10% of total required parking through an administrative land use process.*

This letter serves as approval of a parking reduction request from 172 total spaces required by the Land Development Code to **167 total spaces** proposed (a reduction of five (5) parking spaces, or 2.9% of the total parking) based on the Parking Analysis Memo, dated November 30, 2018, for Cherry Tree Estates (CTE), submitted as part of the application for a Specific Development Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Arapahoe County Code</th>
<th>Required Spaces Calculation</th>
<th>Code Applied to CTE</th>
<th>Approved SDP Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Single-Family Attached (SFA) Residential</strong></td>
<td>2 spaces/unit</td>
<td>45 units = 90 spaces 2 spaces per unit on-site in garage and driveway</td>
<td>90 spaces</td>
<td>90 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plus 0.25 guest space/unit</td>
<td>11.25 spaces</td>
<td>12 spaces</td>
<td>12 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal for SFA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>102 spaces</td>
<td>102 spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Arapahoe County Code</th>
<th>Required Spaces Calculation</th>
<th>Code Applied to CTE</th>
<th>Approved SDP Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arapahoe County: Nursing Home, Assisted Living Residence or Similar Facility (ALR)</strong></td>
<td>1 space per 2 employees</td>
<td>4 employees/building = 2 spaces/building 2 spaces x 7 buildings = 14 spaces total</td>
<td>14 spaces for employees</td>
<td>14 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plus 1 space per 2 beds</td>
<td>16 beds/building = 8 spaces per building 8 spaces x 7 buildings = 56 spaces</td>
<td>56 spaces for beds</td>
<td>51* spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal for ALR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>70 spaces</td>
<td>65 spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Parking Spaces</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>172 spaces</td>
<td>167 spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Parking Requirement Summary chart on the SDP indicates 46 is required per the 0.8 space/bed proposed as an alternate ratio. The final parking design proposes 51 spaces to provide additional guest spaces.
The Specific Development Plan final approval documents (mylar plans) will clearly state that the minimum parking to be provided for the Cherry Tree Estates project will be 167 parking spaces, to include 90 resident spaces and 12 guest spaces for the single-family attached residential units and to include 65 spaces (employee, resident, guest, and service-provider parking) for the assisted-living residences, regardless of the minimum number of spaces calculated under the proposed formula of 0.8 space per bed, and that all parking needs for the daily operation of the facility must be met on site based on the representation of parking needs submitted by the applicant. These numbers represent a 7.14% parking reduction based only on the Assisted-Living Residences and a 2.9% reduction of total parking spaces.

The Parking Analysis Memo provided as part of the application is attached to this parking reduction approval letter as back-up for the request. Thank you for letting us know of your project needs and for providing parking requirements that would apply to a comparable project based on City of Littleton and City of Aurora codes and on Tim VanMeter’s “Almost Home” memory care project in Arvada.

Sincerely,

Jan Yeckes, Planning Division Manager
Public Works and Development
Arapahoe County
720-874-6655 direct/720-874-6650 Planning Office
jyeckes@arapahoegov.com
Parking Analysis Memo

To: Arapahoe County Planning
From: Melissa Kendrick, Kendrick Consulting Inc.
Date: Nov. 30, 2018
Purpose: Parking for Cherry Tree Estates

Proposal: The project proposes 77 surface parking lot spaces and 90 on-site parking spaces in garages and driveways for a total of 167 spaces. Of the 77 surface parking spaces, twelve (12) are identified as guest parking for the single family attached (SFA). Sixty five (65) are for the Assisted Living Residences (ALR). Sixty five is a reduction of five (5) spaces from the Arapahoe County Code requirement of seventy (70) detail below. We are requesting a reduction of (5) spaces per the Code requirement.

To further explain the parking design, there are two separate requirements for parking on this project:

1) Single family attached (SFA) -
   • Two (2) spaces per unit are required plus guest spaces as described below. Consequently, the 45 units require 90 spaces which are proposed, meeting the Arapahoe County Parking regulations for SFA.
   • For guest spaces, 0.25 spaces per unit are required. With 45 units proposed, 12 spaces are required and that is the number provided so the project meets the Code.

2) Assisted living residences (ALR) -
   • Seventy (70) surface spaces are required per the Code as detailed below. Sixty-five spaces are proposed for this project with the justification for this parking plan also described below.
   • The parking ratio we are proposing is 0.8 parking spaces per 2 beds and one (1) space per two (2) employees. The Parking Requirement Charts on the SDP demonstrates that 46 spaces are required based upon the proposed ratio and the project includes 51 spaces exceeding the minimum required.

Justification: The PDP requires the project to either meet the Arapahoe County Code or to justify a reduction in parking. The Analysis Chart on the next page identifies how the parking requirements apply to this project from Arapahoe County, and the cities of Aurora, and Littleton. As demonstrated in the chart, the proposed 65 spaces is greater than the requirements from the other three jurisdictions but five (5) spaces less than Arapahoe County:
   • 56 in Littleton
   • 63 in Aurora
   • 70 in Arapahoe County
Furthermore, Tim VanMeter's memory care facility in Arvada, Almost Home, provides approximately four (4) spaces per building, estimated to be one (1) space per four (4) employees and three (3) for guests/service providers. Rarely are all of the spaces occupied at this facility, however, there are on street parking spaces available which CTE will not have. This project proposes over eight and a half (8.5) spaces per building which is more than double what is needed by his current operations. Consequently, we believe the proposed 65 spaces for the ALR buildings is more than adequate to meet the demand for parking.

Analysis Chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Arapahoe County Code</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Applied to CTE</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Attached (SFA)</td>
<td>2 spaces/unit</td>
<td>45 units=90 spaces</td>
<td>90 spaces</td>
<td>90 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 spaces per unit on-site in garage and driveway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.25 guest spaces/unit</td>
<td>11.25 spaces</td>
<td>12 spaces</td>
<td>12 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102 spaces</td>
<td>102 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Arapahoe County Code</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Required Totals</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County Nursing Home, Assisted Living Residence or Similar Facility</td>
<td>1 space per two employees</td>
<td>4 employees/building= 2 spaces/7 buildings =14 spaces total</td>
<td>14 spaces for employees</td>
<td>14 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plus 1 space per two beds</td>
<td>16 beds/building =8 spaces per building = 7 building/8 spaces = 56 spaces</td>
<td>56 spaces for beds</td>
<td>51* spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70 spaces</td>
<td>65 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172 spaces</td>
<td>167 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Parking Requirement Summary chart on the SDP indicates 46 is required per the 0.8 space/bed. The parking design proposes 51 spaces to provide additional guest spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Applied to CTE</th>
<th>Applied to CTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Littleton Nursing Home/Extended Care</td>
<td>1 space/2 beds</td>
<td>8 spaces/building 7 buildings</td>
<td>56 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Nursing Home</td>
<td>1 space/4 beds</td>
<td>16 beds/building = 4 spaces/building</td>
<td>28 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.25 spaces/staff</td>
<td>4 staff/building = 5 spaces/building</td>
<td>35 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63 spaces total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Melissa: Below is the Microsoft Word text from signed pdf letter provided. I updated the format and language of the table (and the “note below the table) as part of the approval letter for clarity. I am providing this in Word so you can integrate the approved table into your plan set. I also added a statement in bold print after the table that includes language that should be incorporated into the plan set. I felt it was important to clarify that the actual numbers of parking spaces will govern the approval and not just the 0.8 space/bed ratio (although that ratio is useful for explaining how the number was reached). Also a note that “all parking for daily operations must be met on site based on the representations of parking needs submitted” to include on the final plan set. Thanks. Any questions, 720-874-6655 – I am in the office Wed through Monday, December 26th – 31st, then will be out of the office until Monday, January 7th. – Jan

RE: SDP18-002 Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan – Administrative Parking Reduction Approval

The Arapahoe County Land Development Code, Section 12-1200 Parking, 12-1207 General Provisions, C. Parking Reduction Request, states: As part of a land use application, the applicant may submit a request for a reduction in parking requirements to the Planning Manager. The Planning Manager may allow reductions up to 10% of total required parking through an administrative land use process.

This letter serves as approval of a parking reduction request from 172 total spaces required by the Land Development Code to 167 total spaces proposed (a reduction of five (5) parking spaces, or 2.9% of the total parking) based on the Parking Analysis Memo, dated November 30, 2018, for Cherry Tree Estates (CTE), submitted as part of the application for a Specific Development Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Arapahoe County Code</th>
<th>Required Spaces Calculation</th>
<th>Code Applied to CTE</th>
<th>Approved SDP Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Attached (SFA) Residential</td>
<td>2 spaces/unit</td>
<td>45 units = 90 spaces</td>
<td>90 spaces</td>
<td>90 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plus 0.25 guest space/unit</td>
<td>2 spaces per unit on-site in garage and driveway</td>
<td>12 spaces</td>
<td>12 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal for SFA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>102 spaces</td>
<td>102 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Arapahoe County Code</th>
<th>Required Spaces Calculation</th>
<th>Code Applied to CTE</th>
<th>Approved SDP Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County: Nursing Home, Assisted Living Residence or Similar Facility (ALR)</td>
<td>1 space per 2 employees</td>
<td>4 employees/building = 2 spaces/building</td>
<td>14 spaces for employees</td>
<td>14 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 spaces x 7 buildings = 14 spaces total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plus 1 space per 2 beds</td>
<td>16 beds/building = 8 spaces per building</td>
<td>56 spaces for beds</td>
<td>51* spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 spaces x 7 buildings = 56 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal for ALR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70 spaces</td>
<td>65 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>172 spaces</td>
<td>167 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Parking Requirement Summary chart on the SDP indicates 46 is required per the 0.8 space/bed proposed as an alternate ratio. The final parking design proposes 51 spaces to provide additional guest spaces.

The Specific Development Plan final approval documents (mylar plans) will clearly state that the minimum parking to be provided for the Cherry Tree Estates project will be 167 parking spaces, to include 90 resident spaces and 12 guest spaces for the single-family attached residential units and to include 65 spaces (employee, resident, guest, and service-provider parking) for the assisted-living residences, regardless of the minimum number of spaces calculated under the proposed formula of 0.8 space per bed, and that all parking needs for the daily operation of the facility must be met on site based on the representation of parking needs submitted by the applicant. These numbers represent a 7.14% parking reduction based only on the Assisted-Living Residences and a 2.9% reduction of total parking spaces.
Dec. 17, 2018

Arapahoe County Planning
6924 S. Lima St
Centennial, CO 80112

RE: Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan and Minor Subdivision – 4th Submittal

Dear Molly;

We are resubmitting the SDP and the MS applications following the 3rd review comments. The resubmittal includes:

1) SDP redline response  
2) SDP revision  
3) Revised drainage study  
4) Resubmittal Checklist  
5) Revised address plat  
6) MS redlined response  
7) MS revision

**Lighting Detail**

The revised SDP includes the lighting fixtures we discussed. To explain, the bottom of the fixture is at 18’ and the horizontal pole detail is at 20’ above ground. We believe this design meets the Arapahoe County lighting code requiring a maximum of 20’ poles. There is a decorative feature that extends above the 20 feet that we are proposing remain as part of the lighting design. As a project zoned PD, we understand there is flexibility in proposing a variation from the strict interpretation of the code. We believe the decorative design does not negatively impact the height of the light element since the fixture remains below the 20’ requirement.

With this, we believe all the remaining comments have been addressed from the 3rd review and we are ready for public hearing dates.

Sincerely,

**Melissa Kendrick**
Melissa Kendrick  
Kendrick Consulting Inc.

Cc: Tim VanMeter, Owner  
    Kevin Roth, Roth Lang Engineering Group
Molly Orkild-Larson

From: Roger Harvey
Sent: Monday, July 23, 2018 10:50 AM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson
Cc: Raymond Winn
Subject: Cherry Tree Estates SDP and Minor Subdivision - Parks Cash in Lieu
Attachments: Copy of 60% design costs - 2018-06-06.xlsx, 13-003.04_Cherry Creek rec trail pg 34-35.pdf

Molly,

Please forward this to Cherry Tree Estates representatives:

Arapahoe County Open Spaces/Arapahoe County Recreation District has requested that the Appraisal Method be used for determining the development Cash in Lieu of parks in code 14-111.05. Under current development code calculations 0.80 acres are required. Open Spaces is providing two options for applicant: (1.) Open Spaces willing to complete and submit a qualifying appraisal for consideration to Board for current fair market value of required acres. (2.) Open Spaces has calculated the cost for sidewalk/trail that UDFCD, City/County of Denver and Arapahoe County is planning to build as part of the Cherry Creek Restoration Project; cost: $90,000. We request this amount for Cash in Lieu to pay for the sidewalk/trail to be built as part of the project.

Calculation method on this Cash In Lieu amount of $90,000: this amount being request will be directly tied and utilized to pay the cost of the sidewalk/trail, this sidewalk/trail section is shown on attachment 13-003.04, it will be owned and maintained and built on City and County of Denver property. This will then fulfill the conditional requirement for Cherry Tree Estates PDP of having to build a sidewalk. Without this Cash in Lieu funding from Cherry Tree Estates this Sidewalk/Trail will not be built and removed from the project, triggering the condition for approval and requiring Cherry Tree Estates to build the sidewalk. Attached is a 60% engineer design cost for the concrete trail; concrete cost is $75,120 – this does not include mobilization costs, excavation costs, revegetation costs, and GESC costs; our engineer estimates this amount at $15,000 for a rounded total of $90,000. Open spaces feels this cost is fair and less that then Fair Market Value of 0.80 acres using the Appraisal Method.

If the $90,000 Cash in Lieu request is not accepted, Open Spaces will start a Fair Market Value appraisal and request this new amount and the $90,000 offer will be withdrawn and no longer offered.

Thanks, look forward to meeting and further discussing.

Roger Harvey | Open Space Planning Administrator
Arapahoe County Open Spaces
6934 S. Lima Street, Suite A | Centennial, CO 80112
rharvey@arapahoe.gov.com

Arapahoe County Fair
JULY 28-29 2018
Fair Fun for Everyone!
www.arapahoeCountyFair.com
### CONCRETE TRAIL REMOVAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Removal (SF)</th>
<th>Removal (CY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>2147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CONCRETE TRAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Length (LF)</th>
<th>Width (B)</th>
<th>Area (SF)</th>
<th>Area (CY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Regional Concrete Trail</td>
<td>1568</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21175</td>
<td>2317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connector Trail A</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12054</td>
<td>1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connector Trail B</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connector Trail C</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cycle Path Trail</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Concrete Trail</td>
<td>1716</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20440</td>
<td>2227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Concrete Trail - Thickened Edge</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Concrete Trail - Thickened Edge</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3701</td>
<td></td>
<td>57388</td>
<td>6141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Regional Concrete Trail</td>
<td>1514</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19325</td>
<td>2075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connector Trail A</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connector Trail B</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2106</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connector Trail C</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2254</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Concrete Trail</td>
<td>473</td>
<td></td>
<td>5661</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Concrete Trail - Thickened Edge</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Concrete Trail - Thickened Edge</td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23770</td>
<td>2532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3411</td>
<td></td>
<td>63139</td>
<td>6805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Regional Concrete Trail</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19325</td>
<td>2075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connector Trail A</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5360</td>
<td>574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connector Trail B</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2910</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connector Trail C</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8461</td>
<td>905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Concrete Trail</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5661</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Concrete Trail - Thickened Edge</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3269</td>
<td></td>
<td>65206</td>
<td>7055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CRUSHER FINES TRAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Trail Type</th>
<th>Length (LF)</th>
<th>Width (B)</th>
<th>Area (SF)</th>
<th>Area (CY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Regional Crusher Fines Trail - Attached</td>
<td>1512</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18144</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connector Trail A</td>
<td>1262</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5048</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Trail</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2970</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Crusher Fines Trail</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td></td>
<td>5661</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3473</td>
<td></td>
<td>63139</td>
<td>6805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Regional Crusher Fines Trail - Attached</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22085</td>
<td>2385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connector Trail A</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5549</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Crusher Fines Trail</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td></td>
<td>5661</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3926</td>
<td></td>
<td>65206</td>
<td>7055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Regional Crusher Fines Trail - Attached</td>
<td>1347</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connector Trail A</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5661</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary Crusher Fines Trail</td>
<td>1345</td>
<td></td>
<td>5661</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3398</td>
<td></td>
<td>65206</td>
<td>7055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rest Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Area of Rest Stop (SF)</th>
<th>Area of Rest Stop (CY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECONDARY 6" INCH MINUS (TERTIARY) TRAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Length (LF)</th>
<th>Width (B)</th>
<th>Area (SF)</th>
<th>Area (CY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>5337</td>
<td></td>
<td>2974</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Milling & Trenching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Concrete Trail</th>
<th>Concrete Trail Area (SF)</th>
<th>Mill Area (SF)</th>
<th>Mill Area (CY)</th>
<th>Mill Area (CY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>6&quot;-inch minus Trail</th>
<th>Volume (CY)</th>
<th>Total (CY)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Molly Orkild-Larson

From: Joe Richards
Sent: Monday, July 23, 2018 8:07 AM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson
Subject: Building Requirements
Attachments: 2015 Building Basics.pdf

Molly:

Preliminary design information for your project SDP 18-002 see attached.

Thanks:

Joe Richards
Arapahoe County Govt.
Bldg. Div. Manager
Public Works and Development
720-874-6549 Work
720-483-2793 Mobile
jrichards@arapahogov.com
6924 S Lima St
Centennial, CO 80112

ARAPAHOE COUNTY
COLORADO'S FIRST
Arapahoe County adopted codes and design criteria

2015 International Building Code, IBC, including:
- Appendix C, Group U, Agricultural Buildings
- IBC amendments

2015 International Residential Code, IRC, including Appendices:
- Appendix H, Patio Covers
- IRC amendments

2015 Minimum Design Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground Snow Load</th>
<th>Wind Design</th>
<th>Subject to damage from</th>
<th>Winter Barrier Under-</th>
<th>Flood Hazards</th>
<th>Air Freezing Index</th>
<th>Mean Annual Temp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speed MPH</td>
<td>Topographic Effects</td>
<td>Special Wind Region</td>
<td>Seismic Design Category</td>
<td>Weathering</td>
<td>Frost Line depth</td>
<td>Termite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 mph</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>36&quot; inches</td>
<td>Slight to moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2015 International Plumbing Code, IPC
- IPC amendments

2015 International Mechanical Code, IMC
- IMC amendments

2015 International Fuel Gas Code, IFGC
- IFGC amendments

2015 International Existing Building Code, IEBC
- IEBC amendments

2015 International Swimming Pool and Spa Code

2009 International Energy Conservation Code, IECC
- IECC amendments

2017 National Electrical Code, NEC

A117.1-2009 ANSI manual as a reference

Elevator and Escalator Codes
ASME A17.1 – 2013, A17.3 – 2005, A18.1 – 2011 and ASCE 21 Parts 1, 2, 3, and 4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of care</th>
<th>Capability of patients receiving care</th>
<th>Types of facilities</th>
<th>1-5 Occupants</th>
<th>6-16 Occupants</th>
<th>More than 16 occupants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>Capable of responding to emergency situation and complete building evacuation without assistance</td>
<td>Alcohol &amp; drug center: assisted living; congregable care; group home; halfway house; residential board and care; social rehabilitation</td>
<td>R-3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Sec. 308.3.4</td>
<td>R-4, Condition 1 Sec. 308.3.3 &amp; 310.6.1</td>
<td>I-1 Condition 1 Sec. 308.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>Any residents who require limited verbal or physical assistance while responding to emergency situation</td>
<td>Alcohol &amp; drug center: assisted living; congregable care; group home; halfway house; residential board and care; social rehabilitation</td>
<td>R-3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Sec. 308.3.4</td>
<td>R-4, Condition 2 Sec. 308.3.3 &amp; 310.6.2</td>
<td>I-1 Condition 2 Sec. 308.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Incapable of self-preservation</td>
<td>Nursing homes: foster care facilities; facilities providing nursing and medical care but without emergency, surgery or obstetric services or inpatient stabilization for psychiatric or detoxification.</td>
<td>R-3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Sec. 308.4.2</td>
<td>I-2 Condition 1 Sec. 308.4.1.1</td>
<td>I-2 Condition 1 Sec. 308.4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospitals: facilities providing nursing and medical care including emergency, surgery or obstetric services or inpatient stabilization for psychiatric or detoxification.</td>
<td>R-3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; Sec. 308.4.2</td>
<td>I-2 Condition 2 Sec. 308.4.1.2</td>
<td>I-2 Condition 2 Sec. 308.4.1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LESS THAN 24-HOUR CARE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Care or Service</th>
<th>Age and Capability of occupants</th>
<th>Types of Facilities</th>
<th>1-5 in a dwelling unit</th>
<th>1-5 occupants</th>
<th>6 or more occupants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>Any age—Capable of self-preservation</td>
<td>Outpatient clinic; doctor’s office</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>B Sec. 304.1</td>
<td>B Sec. 304.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical, surgical, psychiatric, nursing</td>
<td>Any age—Rendered incapable of self-preservation</td>
<td>Ambulatory care facility</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>B Sec. 304.1</td>
<td>B Sec. 304.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational, supervisory or personal care services</td>
<td>Older than 21/2 years and 12th grade or younger</td>
<td>Day care, Child care</td>
<td>R-3 Sec. 305.2.3</td>
<td>Same of primary occupancy of Building Sec. 305.2.1 &amp; 305.2.2</td>
<td>E&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt; Sec. 305.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodial care</td>
<td>21/2 years or less and older where incapable of self-preservation</td>
<td>Day care, Adult care</td>
<td>R-3 Sec. 308.6.4</td>
<td>Same of primary occupancy of Building Sec. 308.6.2 &amp; 308.6.3</td>
<td>I-4&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt; Sec. 308.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a. This is the option of complying with the International Residential Code providing an NFPA 13D automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with IBC Section 903.3.1.3*

*b. Rooms or spaces within places of religious worship; classified as part of primary occupancy—usually A-3.*

*c. Floors in day care facilities where more than five but no more than 100 infants and toddlers (i.e., children 2 1/2 years or younger in age) can be classified as Group E provided rooms used as such are on the level of exit discharge and have exit door directly to exterior.*

---

Figure 308.1

**OCCUPANCY CLASSIFICATION OF CARE FACILITIES**
June 20, 2018

Molly Orkild-Larson  
Arapahoe County  
6924 South Lima Street  
Centennial, CO 80112  
720-874-6650  
Morkild-larson@arapahoegov.com

Subject: SDP13-002, Cherry Tree Estates - Specific Development Plan

RE: Request to review site plan for a parcel of land located in the Southwest Quarter of Section 21, Township 4 South, Range 67 West, of The 6th Principal Meridian, County of Arapahoe, State of Colorado

Ms. Orkild-Larson,

Qwest Corporation, d/b/a CenturyLink QC has reviewed the proposed Plat as requested. Our approval is hereby given to continue the site approval process with the County of Arapahoe.

If CenturyLink facilities are found to restrict development within the area as described, the Applicant will relocate the facilities at Applicant's expense and within guidelines set by CenturyLink and all regulating entities. All relocations will be done under the supervision of a CenturyLink Inspector.

Sincerely,

Karen Caime

Karen Caime  
Right of Way Agent  
Qwest Corporation d/b/a CENTURYLINK QC  
602.630.1428 Phone  
602.246.1326 Fax  
Karen.Caime@centurylink.com
CASE NUMBER / CASE NAME: SDP18-002, Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan and PM18-002 Cherry Tree Estates Minor Subdivision

Planner: Molly Orkild-Lareon  
Engineer: Sarah White  
Date sent: June 22, 2018  
Date to be returned: July 20, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arapahoe County Agencies</th>
<th>Citizen's Organizations</th>
<th>Conservation District</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Utilities: Gas, Electric &amp; Phone</th>
<th>Water / Sanitation / Stormwater / Wetlands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessor / Arapahoe County</td>
<td>Karen Hart</td>
<td>CCNA-Cherry Creek Neighborhoods Ass.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building / Arapahoe County</td>
<td>Joe Richards</td>
<td>CECON-(Within Centennial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering / Arapahoe County</td>
<td>Sarah White</td>
<td>Four Square Mile Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping / Arapahoe County</td>
<td>Pat Hubert</td>
<td>South Metro Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas / Arapahoe County</td>
<td>Diane Kocis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space / Arapahoe County</td>
<td>Raymond Winn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning / Arapahoe County</td>
<td>Molly Orkild-Larson</td>
<td>Conservation District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff / Arapahoe County</td>
<td>1 to Scott Sickafoose</td>
<td>West Arapahoe Conservation District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 to Glenn Thompson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weed Control / Arapahoe County</td>
<td>Russell Johnson</td>
<td>CDOT / State Highway Dept- Region 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning / Arapahoe County</td>
<td>Caitlyn Cahill</td>
<td>E-470 Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RTD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chris Quinn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Review Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe Library District</td>
<td>Linda Speas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CGS Colorado Geological Survey - Soils</td>
<td>Jill Carlson</td>
<td>Centurylink/Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City - Denver</td>
<td>Amanda Jensen</td>
<td>Conoco Phillips / Gas Pipeline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Parks and Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td>XCEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td></td>
<td>IREA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Metro Fire Rescue District</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cherry Creek Valley Water &amp; Sanitation District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro District</td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Army Corp. of Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Growth Coordinator</td>
<td>Krissy Summerfield</td>
<td>Division of Water Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reap I-70 Regional Economic Advancement Partnership</td>
<td>Gary Duke and Jack Keever</td>
<td>SEMSWA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arapahoe County Parks and Recreation District</td>
<td>Lynn Cornell</td>
<td>Urban Drainage &amp; Flood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District – Cherry Creek</td>
<td>David Strohs</td>
<td>East End Advisory (5 sets)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-County Health Department</td>
<td>Sheila Lynch/Laurel Droten</td>
<td>HOMEOWNER’S ASSOCIATIONS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CONCHA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TOWNHOME ASSOCIATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GRANVILLE WEST HOA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS:</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑ Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Have the following comments to make related to the case:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following comments have been added to the case:

- Comment 1: "Development will significantly impact traffic flow near the intersection of Cherry Creek Road and South Metro Parkway.
- Comment 2: "The proposed development will affect the local water supply in the area.
- Comment 3: "The proposed development will impact the local wildlife habitats."
Hi Molly,

Colorado Geological Survey’s response to the Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan referral (SDP18-002) is attached. The site does not contain, nor is it exposed to, any geologic hazards or geotechnical constraints that would preclude the proposed development. CGS therefore has no objection to approval.

Thanks,
Jill Carlson

Land Use Review Program
Colorado Geological Survey
1801 19th Street
Golden, CO 80401
cgs_lur@mines.edu
303-384-2655

From: Molly Orkild-Larson [MOrkild-Larson@arapahoegov.com]
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2018 9:40 AM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson
Subject: SDP18-002, Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan - Referral Comment

Please review the above mentioned application that can be found at the following link. https://arapahoecounty365-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/morkild-larson_arapahoegov_com/Fin7pCyFQo_qHuuMTs1KsBS_JCSzmWfY08bYoze5R9CA?e=3Rq4qf Contact me if you have any issues accessing the link.

Provide me with your comments on or before July 20, 2018.

Thank you,

Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner
Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
Arapahoe County Lima Plaza, 6924 South Lima Street, Centennial CO 80112
720-874-6650/720-874-6574 TDD/720-874-6611 Fax
Morkild-larson@arapahoegov.com
July 20, 2018

Ms. Molly Orkild-Larson
Arapahoe County Public Works & Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112

Subject: Cherry Tree Estates
       Case Number SDP 18-002 & PM 18-002
       Senior Living and Assisted Living Community

To Whom it May Concern:

Cherry Creek School District No. 5 has reviewed the information provided by the Arapahoe County Department of Planning and Development regarding the development plan for Cherry Tree Estates. The Cherry Creek School District provides educational services to children in the surrounding area residing within the boundaries of the Cherry Creek School District. It is understood that this is an age-restricted living community for seniors. It is the opinion of the Cherry Creek School District that no cash in lieu fees are required at this time due to the fact that this development will not generate students in our schools.

The Cherry Creek School District reserves the right to request cash in lieu fees at a later time if this property is ever sold and/or the utilization of the property changes to include school-aged children. This would be necessary in order to provide adequate educational services for future students.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal. Should you need additional information from Cherry Creek Schools, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

David Strohlfus
Director of Planning and Interagency Relations

cc: David Hart – Chief Officer of Operations
    David Henderson – Director of Facility Operations
Case Number / Case Name: SDP18-002, Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan and PM18-002 Cherry Tree Estates Minor Subdivision
Planner: Molly Orkild-Larson
Engineer: Sarah White
Date sent: June 22, 2018
Date to be returned: July 20, 2018

Arapahoe County Agencies
- Assessor / Arapahoe County (Residential): Karen Hart
- Building / Arapahoe County: Joe Richards
- Engineering / Arapahoe County: Sarah White
- Mapping / Arapahoe County: Pat Hubert
- Oil & Gas / Arapahoe County: Diane Kocis
- Open Space / Arapahoe County: Raymond Winn
- Planning / Arapahoe County: Molly Orkild-Larson
- Sheriff / Arapahoe County: 1 to Scott Sickafoue 1 to Glenn Thompson
- Weed Control / Arapahoe County: Russell Johnson
- Zoning / Arapahoe County: Caitlyn Cahill

Referral Agencies
- Architectural Review Committee: Linda Speas
- Arapahoe Library District: Jill Carlson
- City - Denver: Amanda Jensen
- Colorado Parks and Wildlife: Town
- DRCOG

Citizen's Organizations
- CCNA-Cherry Creek Neighborhoods Ass.
- CECON-(Within Centennial)
- Four Square Mile Neighborhood
- South Metro Chamber of Commerce

Conservation District
- Deer Trail Conservation District
- West Arapahoe Conservation District
- Tasha Chevarria

Transportation
- CDOT / State Highway Dept- Region 1
- Richard Solomon

Utilities: Gas, Electric & Phone
- Centurylink/Phone
- Conoco Phillips / Gas Pipeline
- XCEL
- IREA

Water / Sanitation / Stormwater / Wetlands
- Cherry Creek Valley Water & Sanitation District

Metro District
- U.S. Army Corp. of Engineer
- Division of Water Resources

Post Office Growth Coordinator
- Krissey Summerfield

Reap-70 Regional Economic Advancement Partnership
- Gary Duke and Jack Keever

Arapahoe County Parks and Recreation District
- Lynn Cornell

School District – Cherry Creek
- David Strohfu

Tri-County Health Department
- Sheila Lynch/Laurel Broten

HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATIONS
- CONCHA TOWNHOME ASSOCIATION
- GRANVILLE WEST HOA
- Lance Wheeland

The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

COMMENTS:
- Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted
- Have the following comments to make related to the case: Need to meet the needs of the District.

SIGNATURE
January 23, 2019

Arapahoe County
Darla Brooks
6924 S Lima St
Centennial, CO 80112

Re: Cherry Tree Estates
  1700 S Quebec St.
  Denver, Co 80231

The above referenced property is within the service area of the District. Water and sewer service is available subject to extension of water and sewer lines, payment of all fees, and the District’s Rules and Regulations.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact this office.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John Warford
District Manager
CHERRY CREEK VALLEY WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT
Here it is.

Melissa

-------- Forwarded message --------

From: Lance Wheeland <lwheeland@mac.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 10, 2018 at 4:27 PM
Subject: Cherry Tree Estates proposed plan
To: Tim Vannmeter <vannmeter_t@msn.com>
Cc: Sally and Gene Johnson <musiqueduo@msn.com>, Paul Keebler <Paul.keebler@nm.com>, Marty Steinberg <steinbergmartinn@gmail.com>, Pat Bird <BIRDTrt@aol.com>, Dean and Lisa Forman <dforeman@themulherangroup.com>, Paul J. - CC City Council Elected Kashmann <paul.kashmann@denvergov.org>, <kendrickplanning@gmail.com>

Tim,

Our HOA Board met last evening with homeowners to discuss your proposed plan. I want you to know that we were very pleased with your follow through regarding the things that you said that you were going to do. There were many positive comments regarding the fact that your development is primarily single story dwellings. We also very much appreciated that your development will include gates so that it is not used as a pass through from Colorado Avenue to Quebec.

We’ve identified three issues that we would ask that you will address. First, we would like to develop a joint operating agreement regarding the maintenance of the fence between our properties. As the existing fence is of benefit to Concha and to you and we don’t have access to your property, we would like to discuss sharing the cost of maintenance and upkeep. Secondly, we note in your landscape plan that the property between the fence line and your construction will not permit trees given the drainage and the potential for clogging up the water run off. Our homeowners on that side would appreciate having some visual barrier. Our HOA and these homeowners would appreciate your consideration of providing a compensation for purchasing a couple of trees at the back of each homeowner’s property to help address this concern. Finally, we would ask and hope that your development would have both a start and end date so we do not have to deal with continuous construction over a period of years. Having the noise pollution and truck traffic through Iowa, Trenton and Colorado Avenue negatively impacts our peace and our property values.

Finally, we continue to be very concerned about the visual line in exiting your property onto Quebec. It will be very challenging for drivers to look and behind and over their left shoulder toward the bridge over the canal. We are also concerned about the u-turns that folks will make on Quebec and on Iowa to go south. We think that placing a stop light there would benefit both of us. We recognize, however, that these issues are issues that need to be addressed with Denver and we will continue to do so.

When we receive notification from the County, we may choose to attend the Planning Commission meeting for
final review. I look forward to hearing from you regarding our concerns.

Sincerely,

Lance Wheeland, President
Concha Townhomes Association
1673 S. Trenton Street
Denver, CO 80231
720-440-1818 Wheeland
lwheeland@me.com

---

Melissa Kendrick
Kendrick Consulting Inc.
727 Geneva St.
Aurora, CO 80010
303-725-1295
July 17, 2018

Molly Orklid-Larson
Planner
Arapahoe County Public Works and Development

RE: SDP18-002 Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan
PM18-002 Cherry Tree Estates Minor Subdivision

The 4 Square Mile (4SM) Neighborhoods Development Committee reviewed the plans from Mr. Tim Van Meter for his Cherry Tree Estates Development and make the following statement:

We can support the latest development plan adjusting the height of the buildings in Planning Area 1 to a one story design, and the layout of the 42 dwelling units in Planning Area 2. Also, adding the gates at the two entrances as well as removing the pedestrian trail required in the previously approved PDP. These new changes were shared with the Development Committee at a meeting held July 17, 2018.

We appreciate all the time and effort that Mr. Tim Van Meter has put in his project and we welcome this development to the 4 Square Mile Neighborhood! We also thank him for his time in meeting with the 4 Square Mile Neighborhoods over the past many years.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.

Respectfully Submitted

Mark Lampert
For the
4 Square Mile Neighborhoods
Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner
Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial CO 80112
720-874-6650/720-874-6574 TDD/720-874-6611 Fax
Morkild-larson@arapahoe.gov.com

**Project Name:** Cherry Tree Estates  
**Project File #:** SDP18-002  
**S Metro Review #:** REFPDP18-00106

**Review date:** July 12, 2018 Final revised comments dated January 24, 2019 in RED

**Plan reviewer:** Aaron Miller  
720.989.2246  
aaron.miller@southmetro.org

**Project Summary:** Cherry Tree Estates will be a residential community that provided housing for persons 55 years of age or older including those needing assistance in one or more daily life activities. Scope of review is the proposed specific development plan for seven assisted living buildings, 45 single family attached residential units, a club house and a maintenance building.

Owner: Tim Van Meter
Applicant Representative: Melissa Kendrick


The South Metro Fire Rescue (SMFR) Fire Marshal's Office has reviewed the documents provided. SMFR has comments to be resolved prior to planning approval. Applicants are encouraged to arrange a follow-up meeting to resolve and discuss the items indicated below. Revised plans and additional access exhibits are required prior to approval. SMFR has no objection to the proposed Site Development Plan provided the improvements are designed and constructed in accordance with all applicable codes and standards. Permits from South Metro Fire Rescue will be required prior to work regulated by the adopted Fire Codes.

**UNRESOLVED ISSUES:**

1. Many of the proposed new buildings do not meet the fire apparatus access requirements of the International Fire Code. This deficiency was conveyed to the owners and designers on previous pre-development meetings and was not satisfactorily resolved. Section 503.1.1 of the IFC requires apparatus access roads to extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building. The Fire Code Official is authorized to extend this dimension of 150 feet when the building is equipped throughout with an approved automatic sprinkler system. When equipped with fire sprinkler systems meeting NFPA 13D or NFPA 13R standards, SMFR will approve the dimension increased to maximum 200 feet from the fire apparatus access road to the most remote point of the building perimeter on an approved route. Buildings not meeting the apparatus access distance of 200 feet based on the expectation all residential buildings will be sprinkler protected to NFPA 13D or NFPA 13R include A2, A3, A4, A5, I3, I4, I6.
Revised exhibits indicate alterations to the southeast entrance arrangement and hydrant layout which have resulted in an arrangement which meets the minimum code requirements and provides access to within 200’ of all portions of the perimeter of all buildings. Plans and exhibits indicate all buildings are intended to be equipped with a 13R fire sprinkler system permitting the 200’ distance to be used in lieu of the 150’ distance. Note that the Clubhouse will require a NFPA 13 fire sprinkler system as it is not a residential occupancy.

2. Should buildings be equipped with a fire sprinkler system meeting the requirements of NFPA 13, the fire apparatus access to each building as currently designed would meet the allowable increases of 150’ to one approved side (approximately 25% of the building perimeter) and unlimited to all other sides. Otherwise building and or fire apparatus access requires revisions. Plans and exhibits indicate all buildings are intended to be equipped with a 13R fire sprinkler system. Note that the Clubhouse will require a NFPA 13 fire sprinkler system as it is not a residential occupancy.

3. All proposed fences and gates were not clearly indicated on the proposed plan. The location and arrangement of the expected fences and gates may impact the fire apparatus access distance referenced in the previous comment. A short fire lane is proposed on the south side outside the entry gate. This drive appears to have been provided in an attempt to meet the required fire apparatus access distances. The fire lane and Building 16 are separated by a fence which would inhibit an approved route around the building to meet the required access distances. Revised plans and exhibits indicate the locations of fences and gates in proximity to the southeast entrance. Vehicle Access gates will require separate permits prior to installing gates.

4. The elevation above the proposed finished grade from the overhead power lines shall be provided. Power lines must meet fire apparatus clearance requirements. Response documents indicate the power lines are at 37’ above fire apparatus access meeting the applicable access requirements.

5. Access drives throughout are indicated to be 24’ wide. At this width Fire Lane – No Parking signs are required along both sides of all access roads. A site plan exhibit has been provided indicating fire lane signage will be provided.

6. No sidewalks are provided from the parking area west of building A1 for guests and users to reach the buildings. Shown on revised plans.

7. To the east side of the property a note and area is indicated to be labeled “Tract C 15’ Emergency Access”. Clarify the intent of this designation and if this is required to be connected to the new development. Verify the conditions of any previous agreements or approvals from the City of Denver in place for this emergency access that would be impacted by the proposed development. Documents provided indicated the emergency access easement terminates at the property line and is not required to continue onto the proposed development.

8. Hydrant and water distribution as indicated on the provided Overall Utility Plan does not meet the requirements of Section 507 and Appendix C the IFC. This deficiency was conveyed to the owners and designers on previous pre-development meetings and was not satisfactorily resolved. Hydrant spacing along the eastern private drive greatly exceeds the permitted spacing. The “shed” which is actually a building requires hydrants extended for structure protection. There are no hydrants located on the western access road to the property. Utility and water distribution plans which were revised to address these comments were submitted to SMFR. Water distribution plans were approved January 24, 2019.
August 20, 2018

Ms. Molly Orkild Larson, Senior Planner
Arapahoe County Land Development Services
6942 S. Lima St.
Centennial, CO 80112

RE: Cherry Tree Estates – SDP 1st Comment Response
Fire Rescue Comments
Arapahoe County Case No. SDP18-002
South Metro Fire Rescue Review # REFPDP18-00106

Dear Ms. Orkild:

On behalf of the applicant, Cherry Tree Estates, LLC, this letter contains a summary of the comments received from South Metro Fire Rescue in a letter dated July 12, 2018, to our initial SDP submittal for the Cherry Tree Estates (Project). This letter provides a point by point response (in bold font) to the comments issued by South Metro Fire (in normal font.)

The South Metro Fire Rescue (SMFR) Fire Marshal’s Office has reviewed the documents provided. SMFR has comments to be resolved prior to planning approval. Applicants are encouraged to arrange a follow-up meeting to resolve and discuss the items indicated below. Revised plans and additional access exhibits are required prior to approval.

UNRESOLVED ISSUES:

1. Many of the proposed new buildings do not meet the fire apparatus access requirements of the International Fire Code. This deficiency was conveyed to the owners and designers on previous pre-development meetings and was not satisfactorily resolved. Section 503.1.1 of the IFC requires apparatus access roads to extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building. The Fire Code Official is authorized to extend this dimension of 150 feet when the building is equipped throughout with an approved automatic sprinkler system. When equipped with fire sprinkler systems meeting NFPA 13D or NFPA 13R standards, SMFR will approve the dimension increased to maximum 200 feet from the fire apparatus access road to the most remote point of the building perimeter on an approved route. Buildings not meeting the apparatus access distance of 200 feet based on the expectation all residential buildings will be sprinkler protected to NFPA 13D or NFPA 13R include: A2, A3, A4, A5, I3, I4, I6.

**RESPONSE:** The applicant has been working with South Metro Fire and Rescue (SMFR) to clarify the proposal. An NFPA 13R sprinkler is proposed for all of the residential buildings. Further, an exhibit was submitted demonstrating the hose pull lengths that the applicant is of the belief comply with the 200-ft hose pull criteria. That exhibit has been resubmitted with the revised SDP application.

2. Should buildings be equipped with a fire sprinkler system meeting the requirements of NFPA 13, the fire apparatus access to each building as currently designed would meet the...
allowable increases of 150’ to one approved side (approximately 25% of the building perimeter) and unlimited to all other sides. Otherwise building and or fire apparatus access requires revisions.

RESPONSE: At this time fire sprinklers are proposed that meet the NFPA 13R standard. See comment response above and the revised plans to demonstrate fire apparatus compliance.

3. All proposed fences and gates were not clearly indicated on the proposed plan. The location and arrangement of the expected fences and gates may impact the fire apparatus access distance referenced in the previous comment. A short fire lane is proposed on the south side outside the entry gate. This drive appears to have been provided in an attempt to meet the required fire apparatus access distances. The fire lane and Building 16 are separated by a fence which would inhibit an approved route around the building to meet the required access distances.

Response: The SDP has provided better detail of the limits of fencing and gating. The fire lane on the east side of Building 16 is intended to meet fire apparatus access distances. A fence does surround the perimeter of the site. It is intended for this fire lane to be accessible without crossing or accessing any gates as the emergency vehicles show up on site. An access gate is proposed at the west end of this lane and a gate to the vehicular drives is located to the north of this fire lane, on the main drive. All gates will be controlled with SMFR approved locks/ and operational hardware.

4. The elevation above the proposed finished grade from the overhead power lines shall be provided. Power lines must meet fire apparatus clearance requirements.

RESPONSE: A survey of the power lines is being performed. It is anticipated that the lines are 25’-30’ high at all vehicular crossings. No fill is proposed beneath the lines for the project. The actual elevations will be provided as soon as the survey is complete.

5. Access drives throughout are indicated to be 24’ wide. At this width Fire Lane – No Parking signs are required along both sides of all access roads.

Response: This is understood. The applicant will work with SMFR to place signs on the signing and striping plan that will be prepared with the construction documents at the ASP phase of this project.

6. No sidewalks are provided from the parking area west of building A1 for guests and users to reach the buildings.

Response: Sidewalks have been added.

7. To the east side of the property a note and area is indicated to be labeled “Tract C 15’ Emergency Access”. Clarify the intent of this designation and if this is required to be connected to the new development. Verify the conditions of any previous agreements or approvals from the City of Denver in place for this emergency access that would be impacted by the proposed development.

Response: This easement was shown on a PBG for Granville Estates. The easement terminates at the common property line and has been blocked by a fence, presumably since the adjacent project was constructed. There are no known agreements for continuation onto this property, nor are there any easements recorded against the title that have been reserved for that or any other crossing from Granville Estates. It is my speculation is that this was an agreement between the neighboring developer and the fire department to provide the necessary hose pull lengths, accessible from their site, for these buildings when they were developed in 1983.

8. Hydrant and water distribution as indicated on the provided Overall Utility Plan does not meet the requirements of Section 507 and Appendix C the IFC. This deficiency was conveyed to the owners and designers on previous pre-development meetings and was not satisfactorily resolved. Hydrant spacing along the eastern private drive greatly exceeds the permitted spacing. The “shed” which is actually a building requires hydrants extended for
structure protection. There are no hydrants located on the western access road to the property.

Response: This is understood. Additional hydrants have been added to demonstrate the ability to comply with placement relative to all buildings, including the shed. The applicant will work with SMFR to finalize locations of hydrants during the ASP phase of this project when construction documents are prepared.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this matter. Should you require additional information or clarification, I can be reached at kroth@rothland.com or by phone 303-841-9365. We look forward to bring this issue to resolution.

Sincerely,

ROTH LANG ENGINEERING GROUP, LLC

Kevin S. Roth, P.E., LEED AP
Principal
July 11, 2018

Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner
Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial CO 80112

Re: SDP18-002, Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above-noted application. After reviewing the provided information, we have no concerns about this project.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Linda Speas
Director of Library Operations
## Case Number / Case Name:
SDP18-002, Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan and PM18-002 Cherry Tree Estates Minor Subdivision

## Planner:
Molly Orkild-Larson

## Engineer:
Sarah White

## Date sent:
June 22, 2018

## Date to be returned:
July 20, 2018

### Arapahoe County Agencies
- **Assessor / Arapahoe County (Residential)**: Karen Hart
- **Attorney / Arapahoe County**: Robert Hill
- **Building / Arapahoe County**: Joe Richards
- **Engineering / Arapahoe County**: Sarah White
- **Mapping / Arapahoe County**: Pat Hubert
- **Oil & Gas / Arapahoe County**: Diane Kocis
- **Open Space / Arapahoe County**: Raymond Winn
- **Sheriff / Arapahoe County**: 1 to Scott Sicklefoose
- **Weed Contrld / Arapahoe County**: Russell Johnson
- **Zoning / Arapahoe County**: Caitlyn Cahill

### Citizen’s Organizations
- CCNA-Cherry Creek Neighborhoods Ass.
- CECON-(Within Centennial)
- Four Square Mile Neighborhood
- South Metro Chamber of Commerce
- Conservation District
- Deer Trail Conservation District
- West Arapahoe Conservation District
- Tasha Chevarria

### Transportation
- CDT / State Highway Dept- Region 1
- E-470 Authority
- RTD
- Chris Quinn
- Airport

### Utilities: Gas, Electric & Phone
- Centurylink/Phone
- Conoco Phillips / Gas Pipeline
- XCEL
- IREA
- Brooks Kaufman

### Water / Sanitation / Stormwater / Wetlands
- Cherry Creek Valley Water & Sanitation District
- U.S. Army Corp. of Engineer
- Division of Water Resources
- SEMSWA
- Urban Drainage & Flood
- East End Advisory (5 sets)
- HOMEOWNER’S ASSOCIATIONS CONCHA TOWNHOME ASSOCIATION GRANVILLE WEST HOA
- Lance Wheeland

---

The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

### COMMENTS:
- Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted
- Have the following comments to make related to the case: See comments on redlining plan set.

### SIGNATURE
Molly,  

The only concern the RTD has regarding this development is that as they complete their connection at Quebec they need to coordinate with the RTD to relocate our existing bus stop as it will not meet RTD requirements for offset from intersections.

I have included the requirements for RTD bus stops which the new location will need to meet.

The RTD connect is Michelle Sims at 303-299-6563
**Arapahoe County Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Assessor / Arapahoe County (Residential)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Attorney / Arapahoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Building / Arapahoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Engineering / Arapahoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Mapping / Arapahoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas / Arapahoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Open Space / Arapahoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Planning / Arapahoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Sheriff / Arapahoe County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Citizen’s Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>CCNA-Cherry Creek Neighborhoods Ass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>CECON (Within Centennial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Four Square Mile Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>South Metro Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conservation District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Deer Trail Conservation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>West Arapahoe Conservation District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transportation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>CDOT / State Highway Dept - Region 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>E-470 Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Referral Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>RTD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Utilities: Gas, Electric & Phone**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Centurylink/Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Conoco Phillips / Gas Pipeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>XCEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>IREA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Water / Sanitation / Stormwater / Wetlands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Cherry Creek Valley Water &amp; Sanitation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corp. of Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Division of Water Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>SEMSWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>Urban Drainage &amp; Flood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>East End Advisory (5 sets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>HOMEOWNER’S ASSOCIATIONS CONCHA TOWNHOME ASSOCIATION GRANVILLE WEST HOA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

**COMMENTS:**

- ☑️ Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted
- ☑️ Have the following comments to make related to the case: Ensure adequate methods of emergency access to the gated community.

**SIGNATURE:**

- Glenn Thompson, Bureau Chief
Hi Molly,

I don’t have a lot of issues with this...only 3 that I can think of at the moment:

1) Addresses should be clearly visible on the buildings and homes from the street since this is a senior community/assisted living and we will probably have more medical calls.

2) The community needs to be well lit to include the paired homes and streets.

3) Will the paired homes be using cluster/community mailboxes or individual mailboxes. We have numerous mail theft from cluster mailboxes from time to time and these should be more secured (gated or located inside the clubhouse) with adequate lighting to illuminate the unit for safety.

I would have sent in the referral but I couldn’t fit all of my concerns on it.

Scott

Scott Sickafouse
Deputy Sheriff
Community Resources Unit
13101 E. Broncos Parkway
Centennial, Colorado 80112
720.874.4040

From: Molly Orkild-Larson
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2018 9:41 AM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson <MOrkild-Larson@arapahogov.com>
Subject: SDP18-002, Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan - Referral Comment

Please review the above mentioned application that can be found at the following link. https://arapahocounty365-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/morkild-larson_arapahogov_com/EinZeCyFQq9HuuMTsIx9SgsBSjC5zmqWfY08bYoze5R9CA?e=3Rq4qf Contact me if you have any issues accessing the link.

Provide me with your comments on or before July 20, 2018.
July 20, 2018

Molly Orkild-Larson
Arapahoe County Planning Division
6924 S Lima St
Centennial CO 80112

RE: Cherry Tree Estates
SDP18-002
TCHD Case No. 5010

Dear Ms. Orkild-Larson:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Specific Development Plan to allow 52 residential units, located northeast of the intersection of South Quebec Street and Cherry Creek Drive South. Tri-County Health Department (TCHD) has reviewed the application for compliance with applicable environmental and public health regulations and has the following comments.

**Former Landfill**
When TCHD commented on the Preliminary Development Plan in a letter dated August 24, 2015, TCHD indicated that the property was located on a former landfill and recommended that the applicant work with Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) to determine the best approach to addressing the brownfield on the site. The applicant has worked with CDPHE on a Voluntary Clean Up Program (VCUP). Based on the environmental clean-up process outlined in the VCUP agreement, CDPHE has issued a No Action Determination Letter. See attached. For additional information, contact Fonda Apostolopoulos, CDPHE, at (303) 692-3411.

**Housing and Design Components for Older Adults**
Since older adults comprise the fastest growing segment of the Denver region population, we are pleased that this project is being developed to meet the needs of aging adults. TCHD commends the applicant for including housing that addresses the needs of seniors as safe and accessible housing is a key component in healthy aging.

TCHD commends the applicant for including accessible walkways of seven feet in width along the main development driveways as this will allow for maximum accessibility and utilization of the pedestrian infrastructure by the residents.

TCHD encourages the applicant to consider having all sidewalks through the development be a minimum of clear width of five (5) feet, the space needed for two
people to walk comfortably side by side. This is the typical width recommended for active senior living communities.

Please feel free to contact me at (720) 200-1571 or slynch@tchd.org if you have any questions on TCHD’s comments. If it would be helpful, TCHD staff is happy to meet with staff or the applicant to review our comments.

Sincerely,

Sheila Lynch
Land Use, Built Environment, and Health Program Manager

CC:  Dylan Garrison, Warren Brown, Lisa Oliveto, TCHD; Fonda Apostolopoulos, CDPHE
September 15, 2017

Mr. Tim VanMeter
Chadmor Estates, LLC
P.O. Box 1232
Arvada, CO 80001

RE: No Action Determination Approval for 1702 S. Quebec St., in Denver, CO

Dear Mr. VanMeter:

A No Action Petition (the Petition) was submitted on behalf of Chadmor Estates, LLC (the Applicant) to the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (the Department) pursuant to C.R.S. 25-16-307(2) of the Colorado Voluntary Cleanup and Redevelopment Act. The Petition was submitted for the applicant’s property identified in the Petition and listed here generally as, 1702 S. Quebec St., in Denver, Colorado ("the property").

The Department conducted a review of the environmental data collected on the above-referenced property. Based on this review and pursuant to C.R.S. 25-16-307(2), the Department approves the applicant's Petition and makes the following determinations:

1) The environmental assessment submitted by the applicant and performed by qualified environmental professionals indicates that there is no evidence of contamination released into the environment present from the applicant's operations on the property, which exceeds applicable promulgated state standards or which poses an unacceptable risk to human health and the environment.

Based on the information provided by the applicant concerning property identified in the Petition and listed here generally as, 1702 S. Quebec St., in Denver, Colorado, it is the opinion of the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment that no further action is required to assure that this property, when used for the purposes identified in the No Action Petition (Commercial/Residential), is protective of existing and proposed uses and does not pose an unacceptable risk to human health or the environment at the site.
The approval of the applicant’s Petition by the Department applies only to conditions on the property and state standards that exist as of the time of submission of the Petition. In addition, this approval applies only for the land use specified in the application, which is for Commercial/Residential. This approval shall be considered void if it is determined that materially misleading information has been submitted by the applicant. Nothing in this letter shall be construed to limit the Department’s authority to take actions under existing statutes as necessary, should new information come to the attention of the Department.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (303) 692-3411.

Sincerely,

Funda Apostolopoulos
Voluntary Cleanup Program

File: RV170809-1
**Case Number / Case Name:** SDP18-002, Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan and PM18-002 Cherry Tree Estates Minor Subdivision

**Planner:** Molly Orkild-Larson  
**Engineer:** Sarah White  
**Date sent:** June 22, 2018  
**Date to be returned:** July 20, 2018

### Arapahoe County Agencies
- **Assessor / Arapahoe County (Residential):** Karen Hart  
- **Attorney / Arapahoe County:** Robert Hill  
- **Building / Arapahoe County:** Joe Richards  
- **Engineering / Arapahoe County:** Sarah White  
- **Mapping / Arapahoe County:** Pat Hubert  
- **Oil & Gas / Arapahoe County:** Diane Kocsis  
- **Open Space / Arapahoe County:** Raymond Winn  
- **Planning / Arapahoe County:** Molly Orkild-Larson  
- **Sheriff / Arapahoe County:** 1 to Scott Sickafosse  
  1 to Glenn Thompson  
- **Weed Control / Arapahoe County:** Russell Johnson  
- **Zoning / Arapahoe County:** Caitlyn Cahill

### Citizen’s Organizations
- **CCNA-Cherry Creek Neighborhoods Ass:**  
- **CECON-(Within Centennial):**  
- **Four Square Mile Neighborhood:**  
  Mark Lampert  
- **South Metro Chamber of Commerce:**

### Conservation District
- **Deer Trail Conservation District:**  
- **West Arapahoe Conservation District:**  
  Tasha Chevarria

### Transportation
- **CDOT / State Highway Dept- Region 1:**  
  Richard Solomon  
- **E-470 Authority:**  
  Peggy Davenport  
- **RTD:**  
  Chris Quinn  
- **Airport:**

### Utilities: Gas, Electric & Phone
- **Centurylink/Phone:**  
  Dustin Pulciani  
- **Conoco Phillips / Gas Pipeline:**  
  Donna George  
- **XCEL:**  
  Brooks Kaufman

### Water / Sanitation / Stormwater / Wetlands
- **Cherry Creek Valley Water & Sanitation District:**  
  Kelli Kreyoik  
- **U.S. Army Corp. of Engineer:**  
  Kiel Downing  
- **Division of Water Resources:**  
  Joanne Williams  
- **SEMSWA:**

### Eligible Items
- Part of Road is within Cherry Creek Floodplain, Local
- Floodplain permits are required, No UDFCD Maintenance
July 18, 2018

Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112

Attn: Molly Orkild-Larson

Re: Cherry Tree Estates Final Plat and Specific Development Plan, Case # SDP18-002

Public Service Company of Colorado’s (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has determined there is a potential conflict with the above captioned project. Public Service Company has existing electric transmission lines and associated land rights as shown within this property. Any activity including grading, proposed landscaping, erosion control or similar activities involving our existing right-of-way will require Public Service Company approval. Encroachments across Public Service Company’s easements must be reviewed for safety standards, operational and maintenance clearances, liability issues, and acknowledged with a Public Service Company License Agreement to be executed with the property owner. PSCo is requesting that, prior to any final approval of the development plan, it is the responsibility of the property owner/developer/contractor to contact Mike Diehl, Siting and Land Rights Manager at (303) 571-7260 to have this project assigned to a Land Rights Agent for development plan review and execution of a License Agreement.

In order to ensure that adequate utility easements are available within this development and per state statutes §31-23-214 (3) and 30-28-133(e), PSCo requests that the following language or plat note be placed on the preliminary and final plats for the subdivision:

Ten-foot (10') wide dry utility easements are hereby granted on private property adjacent to the perimeter of the property. These easements are dedicated to the Arapahoe County for the benefit of the applicable utility providers for the installation, maintenance, and replacement of electric, gas, television, cable, and telecommunications facilities (Dry Utilities). Utility easements shall also be granted within any access easements and private streets in the subdivision. Permanent structures, improvements, objects, buildings, wells, and other objects that may interfere with the utility facilities or use thereof (Interfering Objects) shall not be permitted within said utility easements and the utility providers, as grantees, may remove any Interfering Objects at no cost to such grantees, including, without limitation, vegetation. Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCo) and its successors reserve the right to require additional easements and to require the property owner to grant PSCo an easement on its standard form.

Public Service Company also requests that all utility easements be depicted graphically on the preliminary and final plats. While these easements may accommodate certain utilities to be installed in the subdivision, some additional easements may be required as planning and building progresses.

In addition, 31-23-214 (3), C.R.S., requires the subdivider, at the time of subdivision platting, to provide for major utility facilities such as electric substation sites, gas or electric transmission line easements and gas regulator/meter station sites as deemed necessary by PSCo. While this provision will not be required
on every plat, when necessary, PSCo will work with the subdivider to identify appropriate locations. This statute also requires the subdivider to submit a letter of agreement to the municipal/county commission that adequate provision of electrical and/or gas service has been provided to the subdivisions.

The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities via FastApp-Fax-Email-USPS (go to: https://www.xcelenergy.com/start_stop_transfer/new_construction_service_activation_for_builders). It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. Additional easements may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the Utility Notification Center at 1-800-922-1987 to have all utilities located prior to any construction.

Please contact me at donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com or 303-571-3306 if there are any questions with this referral response.

Donna George
Right of Way and Permits
Public Service Company of Colorado
Hello Molly, and happy new year to you.

I am a resident of the Concha subdivision, to the north and east of Cherry Tree Estates.

I have seen the sign and received written notice indicating that the Planning Commission hearing on SDP18-002 has been set for February 5.

I’m confused as to the approval process for the ASP, how it relates to the SDP and its approval. Does approval of the ASP require any public hearing? My concern here is that the latest revision of the SDP contains a couple of sheets that are labeled as “Landscape Plan”. Page 6 of the SDP originally had a table containing information on the open space requirements and required plant quantities, but that information was removed because it’s detailed in the ASP. The landscape plans shown in the ASP (which is in greater detail) and the SDP do not agree with one another as to the proposed plantings. Which document controls what will be required of the applicant? If the landscape plan in the SDP is not accurate, why is it included in the plan set? Any public comment or planning commission discussion on it would be meaningless. I am concerned that any comments regarding (for example) landscaping people may raise at the February S SDP hearing will be dismissed because the ASP has been previously and administratively approved.

Going with the assumption that the more detailed landscape plan in the ASP will rule, and there will be no opportunity to comment on it publicly, I respectfully request that you register my written comments into the record.

- All that is proposed to be planted in the 20’ setback along the north and east property lines is “Low Grow Mix” of grasses that grow 8-12 inches in height. Thus, there will be no visual landscape buffer required to be purchased, planted and maintained by the applicant between the subject property and the affected Concha townhomes.
- Since there are claimed to be existing trees in the setback, there appears to be no reason trees or shrubs over the height of the existing fence cannot be planted in the setback.
- My research has found various varieties of juniper—Spartan, Blue, etc. that grow quickly, do not shed and are suitable for this area.
- It is unfair to shift the cost burden of a visual buffer to the affected homeowners. The applicant should be required to plant a visual buffer, not simply broadcast wild grass seed and call that “landscaping”.

Regarding the SDP, I have emailed you previously about the depiction of the Quebec access on the SDP--that it doesn’t agree with the Denver permit. Back in October, you kindly had Sarah White respond to my concern, and her email stated “the access drive onto Quebec will be constructed per the TEP permit from Denver, as Denver is the permitting jurisdiction. The conceptual drive shown on the planning exhibit will be updated to show the configuration as approved by Denver.”

TEP Permit: As depicted on SDP (and ASP):
Thanks for your time and hope you have a good day.

Lisa Foreman
303-720-5264
l kf1625@comcast.net
I'm sorry, Molly, it's still not clear to me whether or not the Planning Commission approval is at a public hearing as it appears to be stipulated by the “Summary of Procedure for PUD Three Step Review Process” that I snipped below.

That said, you indicated in an earlier email response that the process is in its 2nd review, with referral comments due on 9/25. Can you please tell me what's the timetable after that? About when do you anticipate that the Planning Commission will rule on this case (publicly or privately)? The SDP's greater detail may occasion some comments or questions from our HOA and individual homeowners most affected by this development, and I would like to inform them of the timing.

I am one of the most affected homeowners. Though I still believe the proposed project is too dense, I am relieved that the applicant is planning to construct one-story buildings and gate the community—had this been communicated at the PDP stage, with these intended height limitations as opposed to the two and three-story heights that were submitted, I believe there would have been less opposition from our neighborhood.

Here are my concerns and comments about the SDP and the development going forward.

**Quebec Access:** There appears to be a discrepancy between the depiction of the Quebec access on the PDP and the Denver access permit with which it is supposed to be in conformance.

Access as shown on PDP:

Access as shown on City and County of Denver permit:
Why is the access shown different than what was permitted?

**Landscaping:** There are proposed virtually no new plantings in the setback along the north boundary line separating Cherry Tree Estates from Concha, and the “existing trees” are few and far between. A landscape buffer is highly desirable to provide an eventual screen between the properties higher than the 6’ fence. The trickle channel does not preclude the planting of varieties that do not drop needles and leaves.

**Construction schedule:** According to Jefferson County records regarding the Applicant’s other facility in Arvada, the 6 buildings were built over a 7-year period—one in 2006, two in 2007, two in 2011 and one in 2013. A protracted construction period is a concern here—this development is substantially larger, and at a similar pace, would take many years longer. Additionally, we would like to be assured that construction hours be reasonable and weekend work either prohibited or limited.

If you should have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Lisa Foreman  
lkf1625@comcast.net  
303-720-5264

**From:** Molly Orkild-Larson  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 25, 2018 4:25 PM  
**To:** Lisa  
**Subject:** RE: Cherry Tree Estates (PM18-002; SDP18-002; Q18-084)

Lisa:

This application went through the Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) review process before our land use code for Planned Unit Development was amended. The PDP process establishes the zoning for the property, heights, setbacks, density, open space minimums, etc. The amended code now has a General Development Plan review process instead of the PDP process. Since Cherry Tree Estates has there zoning the next step in the review process is the Specific Development Plan and if this is approved onto the Administrative Site Plan review.
Molly, is it correct to assume that the approval process is per the Planned Unit Development section of the LDC, Section 13-100, adopted 4/1/17? In reviewing that section of the code, it appeared to me that this development would be required to go through the Three-Step Process described in Section 13-105 and illustrated in Figure 13-100.3 below.

This chart indicates that the Planning Commission is the decision maker of the SDP, but also indicates that there will be a public hearing. It’s not clear from your response below whether or not a public hearing is going to be scheduled in connection with the Planning Commission’s meeting on the SDP. Can you please further advise?

Thanks again for your time.

Lisa Foreman
lkf1625@comcast.net
Thanks, Molly, and sorry I wasn’t entirely clear. I’ve looked at Section 2-101 of the Land Development Code—relating to review and decision making authority, as well as Section 13-100 relating to PUDs (effective 4/1/17), and I am thoroughly confused as to what the county approval process is in connection with the 3 cases (PM18-002; SDP18-002 and Q18-084).

- Does an SDP require Planning Commission and BOCC approval and public hearings? I see that the draft SDP document in Citizen Access contains a signature block for the Planning Commission only. I note that there is no reference to an SDP in Table 2-1 (Summary of Review and Decision-Making Authority) of the Land Development code.
- Case PM18-002 appears to relate to a “Minor Subdivision Plat”. However, the draft document in Citizen Access is labeled “Final Plat”. Table 2-1 of the Land Development Code shows different approval processes—a Minor Subdivision Plat requires Planning Commission review and BOCC approval with no public hearing and a Final Plat appears to require BOCC approval and a public hearing. What is this case here?
- Table 2-1 appears to indicate that an Administrative Site Plan is approved by the development staff only. Please confirm.

Thanks again for your assistance. If it is easier to explain the process on the telephone, my number is below.

Lisa Foreman
303-720-5264

---

See my comments below in blue.

From: Molly Orkild-Larson <MOrkild-Larson@arapahoe.gov.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 18, 2018 7:26 AM
To: Lisa <lkf1625@comcast.net>
Subject: Re: Cherry Tree Estates (PM18-002; SDP18-002; Q18-084)

Molly,

I am a resident of Concha, the subdivision adjacent to Cherry Tree Estates. I have been monitoring the progress of the submittal and approval process since the PDP and through the Citizen Access on Arapahoe County’s website, have been paging through the submittals relating to the above referenced cases.
Molly, 

I am a resident of Concha, the subdivision adjacent to Cherry Tree Estates. I have been monitoring the progress of the submittal and approval process since the PDP and through the Citizen Access on Arapahoe County’s website, have been paging through the submittals relating to the above referenced cases.

I would like to ask what is the public process to be going forward? Will there be a time period for public comment on these cases and the submittals? Can you let me know the procedure for public input on the Specific Development Plan and Minor Subdivision Plat process?

Thanks in advance for your advise, and have a great day.

Lisa Foreman
lkf1625@comcast.net
Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner
Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial CO 30112
720-874-6650/720-874-6574 TDD/720-874-6611 Fax
Morkild-larson@arapahoe.gov.com

Project Name: Cherry Tree Estates
Project File #: SDP18-002
S Metro Review #: REFPDP18-000106

Review date: July 12, 2018

Plan reviewer: Aaron Miller
720.989.2246
aaron.miller@southmetro.org

Project Summary: Cherry Tree Estates will be a residential community that provided housing for persons 55 years of age or older including those needing assistance in one or more daily life activities. Scope of review is the proposed specific development plan for seven assisted living buildings, 45 single family attached residential units, a club house and a maintenance building.

Owner: Tim Van Meter
Applicant Representative: Melissa Kendrick


The South Metro Fire Rescue (SMFR) Fire Marshal’s Office has reviewed the documents provided. SMFR has comments to be resolved prior to planning approval. Applicants are encouraged to arrange a follow-up meeting to resolve and discuss the items indicated below. Revised plans and additional access exhibits are required prior to approval.

UNRESOLVED ISSUES:

1. Many of the proposed new buildings do not meet the fire apparatus access requirements of the International Fire Code. This deficiency was conveyed to the owners and designers on previous pre-development meetings and was not satisfactorily resolved. Section 503.1.1 of the IFC requires apparatus access roads to extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building. The Fire Code Official is authorized to extend this dimension of 150 feet when the building is equipped throughout with an approved automatic sprinkler system. When equipped with fire sprinkler systems meeting NFPA 13D or NFPA 13R standards, SMFR will approve the dimension increased to maximum 200 feet from the fire apparatus access road to the most remote point of the building perimeter on an approved route. Buildings not meeting the apparatus access distance of 200 feet based on the expectation all residential buildings will be sprinkler protected to NFPA 13D or NFPA 13R include: A2, A3, A4, A5, I3, I4, I6.
August 20, 2018

Ms. Molly Orkild Larson, Senior Planner
Arapahoe County Land Development Services
6942 S. Lima St.
Centennial, CO 80112

RE: Cherry Tree Estates – SDP 1st Comment Response
Fire Rescue Comments
Arapahoe County Case No. SDP18-002
South Metro Fire Rescue Review # REFPDP18-00106

Dear Ms. Orkild:

On behalf of the applicant, Cherry Tree Estates, LLC, this letter contains a summary of the comments received from South Metro Fire Rescue in a letter dated July 12, 2018, to our initial SDP submittal for the Cherry Tree Estates (Project). This letter provides a point by point response (in bold font) to the comments issued by South Metro Fire (in normal font.)

The South Metro Fire Rescue (SMFR) Fire Marshal’s Office has reviewed the documents provided. SMFR has comments to be resolved prior to planning approval. Applicants are encouraged to arrange a follow-up meeting to resolve and discuss the items indicated below. Revised plans and additional access exhibits are required prior to approval.

UNRESOLVED ISSUES:

1. Many of the proposed new buildings do not meet the fire apparatus access requirements of the International Fire Code. This deficiency was conveyed to the owners and designers on previous pre-development meetings and was not satisfactorily resolved. Section 503.1.1 of the IFC requires apparatus access roads to extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building. The Fire Code Official is authorized to extend this dimension of 150 feet when the building is equipped throughout with an approved automatic sprinkler system. When equipped with fire sprinkler systems meeting NFPA 13D or NFPA 13R standards, SMFR will approve the dimension increased to maximum 200 feet from the fire apparatus access road to the most remote point of the building perimeter on an approved route. Buildings not meeting the apparatus access distance of 200 feet based on the expectation all residential buildings will be sprinkler protected to NFPA 13D or NFPA 13R include: A2, A3, A4, A5, I3, I4, I6.

RESPONSE: The applicant has been working with South Metro Fire and Rescue (SMFR) to clarify the proposal. An NFPA 13R sprinkler is proposed for all of the residential buildings. Further, an exhibit was submitted demonstrating the hose pull lengths that the applicant is of the belief comply with the 200-ft hose pull criteria. That exhibit has been resubmitted with the revised SDP application.

2. Should buildings be equipped with a fire sprinkler system meeting the requirements of NFPA 13, the fire apparatus access to each building as currently designed would meet the
allowable increases of 150’ to one approved side (approximately 25% of the building perimeter) and unlimited to all other sides. Otherwise building and or fire apparatus access requires revisions.

**RESPONSE:** At this time fire sprinklers are proposed that meet the NFPA 13R standard. See comment response above and the revised plans to demonstrate fire apparatus compliance.

3. All proposed fences and gates were not clearly indicated on the proposed plan. The location and arrangement of the expected fences and gates may impact the fire apparatus access distance referenced in the previous comment. A short fire lane is proposed on the south side outside the entry gate. This drive appears to have been provided in an attempt to meet the required fire apparatus access distances. The fire lane and Building 16 are separated by a fence which would inhibit an approved route around the building to meet the required access distances.

**Response:** The SDP has provided better detail of the limits of fencing and gating. The fire lane on the east side of Building 16 is intended to meet fire apparatus access distances. A fence does surround the perimeter of the site. It is intended for this fire lane to be accessible without crossing or accessing any gates as the emergency vehicles show up on site. An access gate is proposed at the west end of this lane and a gate to the vehicular drives is located to the north of this fire lane, on the main drive. All gates will be controlled with SMFR approved locks/ and operational hardware.

4. The elevation above the proposed finished grade from the overhead power lines shall be provided. Power lines must meet fire apparatus clearance requirements.

**RESPONSE:** A survey of the power lines is being performed. It is anticipated that the lines are 25’-30’ high at all vehicular crossings. No fill is proposed beneath the lines for the project. The actual elevations will be provided as soon as the survey is complete.

5. Access drives throughout are indicated to be 24’ wide. At this width Fire Lane – No Parking signs are required along both sides of all access roads.

**Response:** This is understood. The applicant will work with SMFR to place signs on the signing and striping plan that will be prepared with the construction documents at the ASP phase of this project.

6. No sidewalks are provided from the parking area west of building A1 for guests and users to reach the buildings.

**Response:** Sidewalks have been added.

7. To the east side of the property a note and area is indicated to be labeled “Tract C 15’ Emergency Access”. Clarify the intent of this designation and if this is required to be connected to the new development. Verify the conditions of any previous agreements or approvals from the City of Denver in place for this emergency access that would be impacted by the proposed development.

**Response:** This easement was shown on a PBG for Granville Estates. The easement terminates at the common property line and has been blocked by a fence, presumably since the adjacent project was constructed. There are no known agreements for continuation onto this property, nor are there any easements recorded against the title that have been reserved for that or any other crossing from Granville Estates. It is my speculation is that this was an agreement between the neighboring developer and the fire department to provide the necessary hose pull lengths, accessible from their site, for these buildings when they were developed in 1983.

8. Hydrant and water distribution as indicated on the provided Overall Utility Plan does not meet the requirements of Section 507 and Appendix C the IFC. This deficiency was conveyed to the owners and designers on previous pre-development meetings and was not satisfactorily resolved. Hydrant spacing along the eastern private drive greatly exceeds the permitted spacing. The “shed” which is actually a building requires hydrants extended for
structure protection. There are no hydrants located on the western access road to the property.

Response: This is understood. Additional hydrants have been added to demonstrate the ability to comply with placement relative to all buildings, including the shed. The applicant will work with SMFR to finalize locations of hydrants during the ASP phase of this project when construction documents are prepared.

Thank you very much for your consideration of this matter. Should you require additional information or clarification, I can be reached at kroth@rothland.com or by phone 303-841-9365. We look forward to bring this issue to resolution.

Sincerely,

ROTH LANG ENGINEERING GROUP, LLC

Kevin S. Roth, P.E., LEED AP
Principal
July 20, 2018

Molly Orkild-Larson
Arapahoe County Planning Division
6924 S Lima St
Centennial CO 80112

RE: Cherry Tree Estates
SDP18-002
TCHD Case No. 5010

Dear Ms. Orkild-Larson:

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the Specific Development Plan to allow 52 residential units, located northeast of the intersection of South Quebec Street and Cherry Creek Drive South. Tri-County Health Department (TCHD) has reviewed the application for compliance with applicable environmental and public health regulations and has the following comments.

**Former Landfill**

When TCHD commented on the Preliminary Development Plan in a letter dated August 24, 2015, TCHD indicated that the property was located on a former landfill and recommended that the applicant work with Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) to determine the best approach to addressing the brownfield on the site. The applicant has worked with CDPHE on a Voluntary Clean Up Program (VCUP). Based on the environmental clean-up process outlined in the VCUP agreement, CDPHE has issued a No Action Determination Letter. See attached. For additional information, contact Fonda Apostolopoulos, CDPHE, at (303) 692-3411.

**Housing and Design Components for Older Adults**

Since older adults comprise the fastest growing segment of the Denver region population, we are pleased that this project is being developed to meet the needs of aging adults. TCHD commends the applicant for including housing that addresses the needs of seniors as safe and accessible housing is a key component in healthy aging.

TCHD commends the applicant for including accessible walkways of seven feet in width along the main development driveways as this will allow for maximum accessibility and utilization of the pedestrian infrastructure by the residents.

TCHD encourages the applicant to consider having all sidewalks through the development be a minimum of clear width of five (5) feet, the space needed for two
people to walk comfortably side by side. This is the typical width recommended for active senior living communities.

Please feel free to contact me at (720) 200-1571 or slynch@tchd.org if you have any questions on TCHD’s comments. If it would be helpful, TCHD staff is happy to meet with staff or the applicant to review our comments.

Sincerely,

Sheila Lynch
Land Use, Built Environment, and Health Program Manager

CC: Dylan Garrison, Warren Brown, Lisa Oliveto, TCHD; Fonda Apostolopoulos, CDPHE
Molly Orkild-Larson

From: Glenn Thompson
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 5:57 PM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson
Subject: RE: Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan

That would be helpful to have it identified with the full address on Quebec St.

Glenn Thompson
Bureau Chief
Public Safety Bureau
13101 E. Broncos Parkway
Centennial, Colorado 80122
720-874-4023

ARAPAHOE SHERIFF

---

From: Molly Orkild-Larson
Sent: Thursday, August 30, 2018 10:21 AM
To: Glenn Thompson <GThompson@arapahoegov.com>; Scott Sickafoose <SSickafoose@arapahoegov.com>; Jeff Sceili <jeff.sceili@southmetro.org>
Cc: Melissa Kendrick <kendrickplanning@gmail.com>
Subject: Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan

As you’re aware, this proposed memory care and senior living development is land locked by the City and County of Denver and setback a distance from S. Quebec Street. See attached plan set. My question for you is: Do your agencies require signage along a public road for such facilities that would provide the address and name of the development for safety reasons and quick emergency access?

Thanks,
Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner
Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
Arapahoe County Lima Plaza, 6924 South Lima Street, Centennial CO 80112
720-874-6650/ 720-874-6658 TDD/ 720-874-6611 Fax
Morkild-larson@arapahoegov.com
**Arapahoe County Agencies**  
- Assessor / Arapahoe County (Residential): Karen Hart  
- Attorney / Arapahoe County: Robert Hill  
- Building / Arapahoe County: Joe Richards  
- Engineering / Arapahoe County: Sarah White  
- Mapping / Arapahoe County: Pat Hubert  
- Oil & Gas / Arapahoe County: Diane Kocis  
- Open Space / Arapahoe County: Raymond Winn  
- Planning / Arapahoe County: Molly Orkild-Larson  
- Sheriff / Arapahoe County: Scott Sickafoue 1 to Glenn Thompson  
- Weed Control / Arapahoe County: Russell Johnson  
- Zoning / Arapahoe County: Caitlyn Cahill

**Citizen’s Organizations**  
- CCNA-Cherry Creek Neighborhoods Ass.  
- CECON-(Within Centennial)  
- Four Square Mile Neighborhood: Mark Lampert  
- South Metro Chamber of Commerce

**Conservation District**  
- West Arapahoe Conservation District: Tasha Chevaria

**Transportation**  
- CDOT / State Highway Dept- Region 1: Richard Solomon

**Utilities: Gas, Electric & Phone**  
- Centurylink/Phone: Dustin Pulciani  
- Conoco Phillips / Gas Pipeline: Donna George  
- XCEL: Brooks Kaufman

**Water / Sanitation / Stormwater / Wetlands**  
- Cherry Creek Valley Water & Sanitation District: Kelli Kreyck  
- U.S. Army Corp. of Engineer: Kiel Downing  
- Division of Water Resources: Joanne Williams  
- SEMSWA

**Referral Agencies**  
- Architectural Review Committee  
- Airport: Chris Quinn

**Case Number / Case Name:** SDP18-002, Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan and PM18-002 Cherry Tree Estates Minor Subdivision  
**Planner:** Molly Orkild-Larson  
**Engineer:** Sarah White  
**Date sent:** June 22, 2018  
**Date to be returned:** July 20, 2018

Emergency access will meet all S. Metro Fire District standards. The owner is working closely with the District.

The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

**COMMENTS:**  
- Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted  
- Have the following comments to make related to the case: Ensure adequate methods of emergency access to the gated community.

**SIGNATURE:**
- Glenn Thompson, Bureau Chief
Hi Molly,

I don’t have a lot of issues with this...only 3 that I can think of at the moment:

1) Addresses should be clearly visible on the buildings and homes from the street since this is a senior community/assisted living and we will probably have more medical calls.
2) The community needs to be well lit to include the paired homes and streets.
3) Will the paired homes be using cluster/community mailboxes or individual mailboxes. We have numerous mail theft from cluster mailboxes from time to time and these should be more secured (gated or located inside the clubhouse) with adequate lighting to illuminate the unit for safety.

I would have sent in the referral but I couldn’t fit all of my concerns on it.

Scott

Scott Sickafoose
Deputy Sheriff
Community Resources Unit
13101 E. Broncos Parkway
Centennial, Colorado 80112
720.874.4040

The project team is working with the Sheriff’s Department to address signage as indicated in the Submittal letter.

From: Molly Orkild-Larson
Sent: Friday, June 22, 2018 9:41 AM
To: Molly Orkild-Larson <MOrkild-Larson@arapahogov.com>
Subject: SDP18-002, Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan - Referral Comment

Please review the above mentioned application that can be found at the following link. [https://arapahoeCounty365-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/morkild-larson_arapahogov_com/EinZeCyFQq9HuuMTsIIX9SgsBS_JCSzmWFy08bYoze5R9CA?e=3Rq4qt](https://arapahoeCounty365-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/morkild-larson_arapahogov_com/EinZeCyFQq9HuuMTsIIX9SgsBS_JCSzmWFy08bYoze5R9CA?e=3Rq4qt) Contact me if you have any issues accessing the link.

Provide me with your comments on or before July 20, 2018.
Thank you,

Molly Orkild-Larson, Senior Planner  
Arapahoe County Public Works and Development 
Arapahoe County Lima Plaza, 6924 South Lima Street, Centennial CO 80112 
720-874-6650/ 720-874-6574 TDD/ 720-874-6611 Fax 
Morkild-larson@arapahoegov.com
Molly,  

The only concern the RTD has regarding this development is that as they complete their connection at Quebec they need to coordinate with the RTD to relocate our existing bus stop as it will not meet RTD requirements for off set from intersections.

I have included the requirements for RTD bus stops which the new location will need to meet.

The RTD connect is Michelle Sims at 303-299-6563. The owner will work with RTD to meet their objectives. We will work with RTD as requested by Mr. Woodruff so the relocation of the bus stop meets their requirements.
2. Should buildings be equipped with a fire sprinkler system meeting the requirements of NFPA 13, the fire apparatus access to each building as currently designed would meet the allowable increases of 150' to one approved side (approximately 25% of the building perimeter) and unlimited to all other sides. Otherwise building and or fire apparatus access requires revisions.

3. All proposed fences and gates were not clearly indicated on the proposed plan. The location and arrangement of the expected fences and gates may impact the fire apparatus access distance referenced in the previous comment. A short fire lane is proposed on the south side outside the entry gate. This drive appears to have been provided in an attempt to meet the required fire apparatus access distances. The fire lane and Building I6 are separated by a fence which would inhibit an approved route around the building to meet the required access distances.

4. The elevation above the proposed finished grade from the overhead power lines shall be provided. Power lines must meet fire apparatus clearance requirements.

5. Access drives throughout are indicated to be 24' wide. At this width Fire Lane – No Parking signs are required along both sides of all access roads.

6. No sidewalks are provided from the parking area west of building A1 for guests and users to reach the buildings.

7. To the east side of the property a note and area is indicated to be labeled “Tract C 15' Emergency Access”. Clarify the intent of this designation and if this is required to be connected to the new development. Verify the conditions of any previous agreements or approvals from the City of Denver in place for this emergency access that would be impacted by the proposed development.

8. Hydrant and water distribution as indicated on the provided Overall Utility Plan does not meet the requirements of Section 507 and Appendix C the IFC. This deficiency was conveyed to the owners and designers on previous pre-development meetings and was not satisfactorily resolved. Hydrant spacing along the eastern private drive greatly exceeds the permitted spacing. The "shed" which is actually a building requires hydrants extended for structure protection. There are no hydrants located on the western access road to the property.
Case Number / Case Name: SDP18-002, Cherry Tree Estates Specific Development Plan and PM18-002 Cherry Tree Estates Minor Subdivision
Planner: Molly Orkild-Larson
Engineer: Sarah White
Date sent: June 22, 2018
Date to be returned: July 20, 2018

The owner is working closely with the District to meet all necessary requirements.

### Arapahoe County Agencies
- **Assessor / Arapahoe County (Residential)**: Karen Hart
- **Attorney / Arapahoe County**: Robert Hill
- **Building / Arapahoe County**: Joe Richards
- **Engineering / Arapahoe County**: Sarah White
- **Mapping / Arapahoe County**: Pat Hubert
- **Oil & Gas / Arapahoe County**: Diane Kocis
- **Open Space / Arapahoe County**: Raymond Winn
- **Planning / Arapahoe County**: Molly Orkild-Larson
- **Sheriff / Arapahoe County**: 1 to Scott Skafoose, 1 to Glenn Thompson
- **Weed Control / Arapahoe County**: Russell Johnson
- **Zoning / Arapahoe County**: Caitlyn Cahill

### Citizen's Organizations
- CCNA-Cherry Creek Neighborhoods Ass.
- CECON-(Within Centennial)
- Four Square Mile Neighborhood
- South Metro Chamber of Commerce

### Conservation District
- Deer Trail Conservation District
- West Arapahoe Conservation District

### Transportation
- CDOT / State Highway Dept- Region 1
- E-470 Authority
- RTD
- Airport

### Architectural Review Committee
- Arapahoe Library District
- Linda Speas

### Utilities: Gas, Electric & Phone
- CGS Colorado Geological Survey Soils
- Jill Carlson
- City - Denver
- Amanda Jonesen
- Colorado Parks and Wildlife
- XCEL
- Town
- IREA

### Water / Sanitation / Stormwater / Wetlands
- South Metro Fire Rescue District
- Cherry Creek Valley Water & Sanitation District

### Metro District
- Metro District
- Krissy Summerfield

### Post Office Growth Coordinator
- Post Office Growth Coordinator
- Krissy Summerfield

### Reap I-70 Regional Economic Advancement Partnership
- Gary Duke and Jack Keever

### Arapahoe County Parks and Recreation District
- Lynn Cornell

### School District – Cherry Creek
- David Strohfs

### Tri-County Health Department
- Sheila Lynch/Laurel Broten

### HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATIONS
- CONCHA TOWNHOME ASSOCIATION
- GRANVILLE WEST HOA
- Lance Wheeland

The enclosed case has been submitted to the Arapahoe County Planning Office for consideration. Because of the possible effect of the proposed development upon your area, the case is being referred for your comment. Please examine this request and, after review, check the appropriate line and return to the Arapahoe County Planning Office on or before the date indicated above.

**COMMENTS:**
- [ ] Have NO Comments to make on the case as submitted
- [X] Have the following comments to make related to the case: Need to meet the audit reg of the District
June 20, 2018

Molly Orkild-Larson
Arapahoe County
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112
720-874-6650
Morkild-larson@arapahoegov.com

Subject: SDP18-002, Cherry Tree Estates - Specific Development Plan

RE: Request to review site plan for a parcel of land located in the Southwest Quarter of Section 21, Township 4 South, Range 67 West, of The 6th Principal Meridian, County of Arapahoe, State of Colorado

The owner and his team will work with the agency through the construction process.

Ms. Orkild-Larson,

Qwest Corporation, d/b/a CenturyLink QC has reviewed the proposed Plat as requested. Our approval is hereby given to continue the site approval process with the County of Arapahoe.

If CenturyLink facilities are found to restrict development within the area as described, the Applicant will relocate the facilities at Applicant’s expense and within guidelines set by CenturyLink and all regulating entities. All relocations will be done under the supervision of a CenturyLink inspector.

Sincerely,

Karen Caime

Karen Caime
Right of Way Agent
Qwest Corporation d/b/a CENTURYLINK QC
602.630.1428 Phone
602.246.1326 Fax
Karen.Caime@centurylink.com

P801346
Nov. 8 - Tim VanMeter, the owner acknowledges that he will continue working with Xcel and provide all final plans with the ASP submittal for their review and approval.

Molly Orkild-Larson

From: Muncy, Lynette L <Lynette.Muncy@xcelenergy.com>
Sent: Friday, September 07, 2018 2:14 PM
To: VANMETER_T@msn.com
Cc: Molly Orkild-Larson
Subject: RE: Development at Cherry Creek and Quebec

Hello,

I Routed your application and preliminary plans for Cherry Tree Estates project to PSCo Engineering department.

After their review of the documentation, their comment was to keep us informed of site plans submitted to the City for review and approval as you make progress. We will need further information regarding any lighting, landscaping, clear access to PSCo towers and across trickle channel these are some of the detailed designs needed to be review by PSCo as you move to ards final plan. Once final plans are reviewed and approved by PSCo, we will prepare a License for approval of the encroachment of PSCo’s easement right of way.

Please keep us informed. Thank you.

Thank you,

Lynette Muncy

Xcel Energy | Responsible By Nature
Contract Agent III
Siting and Land Rights
1800 Larimer St., Suite 400, Denver, CO 80202
(P) 303-571-7286
(E) Lynette.Muncy@xcelenergy.com

From: Muncy, Lynette L
Sent: Friday, August 24, 2018 1:59 PM
To: 'VANMETER_T@msn.com'
Subject: FW: Development at Cherry Creek and Quebec

Hello Mr. VanMeter:

I am the Contract Agent assigned to your project for a residential development for persons 55 yrs of age or older. I am in receipt of your application, site plans and correspondence from Donna George, Xcel Energy’s processor of referrals, to the County of Arapahoe. Donna sent a Letter of conflict which basically means the project encroaches Xcel’s facilities and needs further review to determine any conflicts. It is my understanding that the project is preliminary right now. I will submit what I have to Xcel Energy’s Engineering group for their preliminary comments. This will help to incorporate any revisions or concerns that may needed prior to final form or strategy of any conflicts.

I will get back to you once I hear back from them.

Thank you,

Lynette Muncy
From: Muncy, Lynette L  
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2018 11:31 AM  
To: Diehl, Michael E  
Subject: RE: Development at Cherry Creek and Quebec

Thanks Mike.

From: Diehl, Michael E  
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2018 11:30 AM  
To: Muncy, Lynette L  
Subject: FW: Development at Cherry Creek and Quebec

I believe this is redundant to the information that accompanied my message with all the investigation listed, but just in case it isn’t. Thank you very much for taking this one.

Safety Brings You Home
HAVE A SAFE DAY
Michael E. Diehl, Manager
Siting and Land Rights
Xcel Energy | Responsible By Nature
1800 Larimer Street, Suite 400
Denver, CO 80202
(Office) 303-571-7260
(Cell) 303-810-9707
(Fax) 303-294-2088
(e-mail) michael.diehl@xcelenergy.com

This email is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC Sections 2510-2521. This email, and any attachments, may contain confidential, private and/or privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for the recipient), please contact the sender by reply mail and delete all copies of this message and any attachments.

From: Timothy VanMeter [mailto:VANMETER.T@msn.com]  
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 2:53 PM  
To: Diehl, Michael E  
Cc: mbuchter@rothlang.com; kroth@rothengineering.com  
Subject: Fw: Development at Cherry Creek and Quebec
XCEL ENERGY SECURITY NOTICE: This email originated from an external sender. Exercise caution before clicking on any links or attachments and consider whether you know the sender. For more information please visit the Phishing page on XpressNET.

Michael,

I should have waited until I had application and ROW documents before sending the plans to you. Attached is the whole application.

Tim VanMeter
----- Original Message ----- 
From: Matthew Buchter
To: Timothy VanMeter
Cc: Kevin Roth
Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 10:09 AM
Subject: RE: Development at Cherry Creek and Quebec

Good Morning Tim,

I have attached a copy of the latest utility plan and site plan for your records. Let me know if you have any difficulties opening the files.

Thanks

Matt Buchter, E.I.

7853 E. Arapahoe Ct., Suite 2500
Centennial, CO 80112

303-841-9365 (o)
303-648-5212 (f)
mbuchter@rothlang.com
www.rothengineering.com

This communication, including attachments, may contain confidential, proprietary or privileged information and is intended solely for the use of the addressee(s). Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Kevin Roth
Sent: Sunday, June 10, 2018 1:26 PM
To: Timothy VanMeter <VANMETER_T@msn.com>
Cc: Matthew Buchter <mbuchter@rothlang.com>
Subject: RE: Development at Cherry Creek and Quebec

O.k. Great. We are going to send a new plan tomorrow, just to make sure you have the latest.

Thanks

Kevin
From: Timothy VanMeter <VANMETER_T@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, May 4, 2018 9:58 AM
To: Kevin Roth <kroth@rothlang.com>
Subject: Fw: Development at Cherry Creek and Quebec

----- Original Message -----
From: Dieh, Michael E
To: Timothy VanMeter
Sent: Friday, May 04, 2018 9:09 AM
Subject: Fw: Development at Cherry Creek and Quebec

This is the last correspondence I have to/from you. I have not received a filled out Encroachment Application from you.
Safety Brings You Home
HAVE A SAFE DAY
Michael E. Diehl, Manager
Siting and Land Rights
Xcel Energy I Responsible By Nature
1800 Larimer Street, Suite 400
Denver, CO 80202
(Office) 303-571-7260
(Cell) 303-810-9707
(Fax) 303-294-2088
(e-mail) michael.diehl@xcelenergy.com

This email is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC Sections 2510-2521. This email, and any attachments, may contain confidential, private and/or privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for the recipient), please contact the sender by reply mail and delete all copies of this message and any attachments.

From: Diehl, Michael E
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 2:22 PM
To: 'Timothy VanMeter'
Subject: RE: Development at Cherry Creek and Quebec

Attached is the same application I sent you earlier. You should be able to print it without a password. To fill it out electronically, you may need to enter the code I mentioned below: 7281. Please let me know if you are still having trouble.

Safety Brings You Home
HAVE A SAFE DAY
Michael E. Diehl, Manager
Siting and Land Rights
Xcel Energy I Responsible By Nature
1800 Larimer Street, Suite 400
Denver, CO 80202
(Office) 303-571-7260
(Cell) 303-810-9707
(Fax) 303-294-2088
(e-mail) michael.diehl@xcelenergy.com

This email is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC Sections 2510-2521. This email, and any attachments, may contain confidential, private and/or privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for the recipient), please contact the sender by reply mail and delete all copies of this message and any attachments.

From: Timothy VanMeter [mailto:VANMETER_T@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, March 05, 2018 2:17 PM
To: Diehl, Michael E
Subject: Re: Development at Cherry Creek and Quebec

XCEL ENERGY SECURITY NOTICE: This email originated from an external sender. Exercise caution before clicking on any links or attachments and consider whether
you know the sender. For more information please visit the Phishing page on XpressNET.

Michael,

We have finally moved forward with our development plans for my site. I tried to print the attached encroachment form but it is protected by password from Teresa Wilson???
If you send me an attachment that I can fill out I will and send you a site plan. The world of computers and cyber protection that we live in.

Tim VanMeter
303-888-5459

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Diehl, Michael E
To: vanmeter_t@msn.com
Sent: Friday, May 05, 2017 12:13 PM
Subject: Development at Cherry Creek and Quebec

Please fill out the attached Encroachment Application and send it back to me. We will review your plans and provide comment and/or a license agreement for what you plan to do. Disregard the $500 review fee. Use code 7281 if the attached comes across as "read only." Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Safety Brings You Home
HAVE A SAFE DAY
Michael E. Diehl, Manager
Siting and Land Rights
Xcel Energy I Responsible By Nature
1800 Larimer Street, Suite 400
Denver, CO 80202
(Office) 303-571-7260
(Cell) 303-810-9707
(Fax) 303-294-2088
(e-mail) michael.diehl@xcelenergy.com

This email is covered by the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, 18 USC Sections 2510-2521. This email, and any attachments, may contain confidential, private and/or privileged material for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any review, use, distribution or disclosure by others is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient (or authorized to receive for the recipient), please contact the sender by reply mail and delete all copies of this message and any attachments.

XCEL ENERGY SECURITY NOTICE: This email originated from an external sender. Exercise caution before clicking on any links or attachments and consider whether you know the sender. For more information please visit the Phishing page on XpressNET.
July 18, 2018
August 28, 2018

Arapahoe County Public Works and Development
6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112

Attn: Molly Orkild-Larson

Re: Cherry Tree Estates Final Plat and Specific Development Plan, Case # SDP18-002

Public Service Company of Colorado’s (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has determined there is a potential conflict with the above captioned project. Public Service Company has existing electric transmission lines and associated land rights as shown within this property. Any activity including grading, proposed landscaping, erosion control or similar activities involving our existing right-of-way will require Public Service Company approval. Encroachments across Public Service Company’s easements must be reviewed for safety standards, operational and maintenance clearances, liability issues, and acknowledged with a Public Service Company License Agreement to be executed with the property owner. PSCo is requesting that, prior to any final approval of the development plan, it is the responsibility of the property owner/developer/contractor to contact Mike Diehl, Siting and Land Rights Manager at (303) 571-7260 to have this project assigned to a Land Rights Agent for development plan review and execution of a License Agreement.

We are working with Mike Diehl and his team to ensure the SDP complies with their restrictions for the transmission lines.

In order to ensure that adequate utility easements are available within this development and per state statutes §31-23-214 (3) and 30-28-133(e), PSCo requests that the following language or plat note be placed on the preliminary and final plats for the subdivision:

Ten-foot (10’) wide dry utility easements are hereby granted on private property adjacent to the perimeter of the property. These easements are dedicated to the Arapahoe County for the benefit of the applicable utility providers for the installation, maintenance, and replacement of electric, gas, television, cable, and telecommunications facilities (Dry Utilities). Utility easements shall also be granted within any access easements and private streets in the subdivision. Permanent structures, improvements, objects, buildings, wells, and other objects that may interfere with the utility facilities or use thereof (Interfering Objects) shall not be permitted within said utility easements and the utility providers, as grantees, may remove any Interfering Objects at no cost to such grantees, including, without limitation, vegetation. Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCo) and its successors reserve the right to require additional easements and to require the property owner to grant PSCo an easement on its standard form.

Note was added as #5 on the cover sheet of the plat document
Public Service Company also requests that all utility easements be depicted graphically on the preliminary and final plats. While these easements may accommodate certain utilities to be installed in the subdivision, some additional easements may be required as planning and building progresses.

In addition, 31-23-214 (3), C.R.S., requires the subdivider, at the time of subdivision platting, to provide for major utility facilities such as electric substation sites, gas or electric transmission line easements and gas regulator/meter station sites as deemed necessary by PSCo. While this provision will not be required on every plat, when necessary, PSCo will work with the subdivider to identify appropriate locations. This statute also requires the subdivider to submit a letter of agreement to the municipal/county commission that adequate provision of electrical and/or gas service has been provided to the subdivisions.

The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities via FastApp-Fax-Email-USPS (go to: https://www.xcelenergy.com/start_stop_transfer/new_construction_service_activation_for_builders). It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. Additional easements may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the Utility Notification Center at 1-800-922-1987 to have all utilities located prior to any construction.

Please contact me at donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com or 303-571-3306 if there are any questions with this referral response.

Donna George
Right of Way and Permits
Public Service Company of Colorado
Lance,

Attached are the responses to the four items in your recent e-mail regarding Cherry Tree Estates. It is unfortunate that the Concha board did not come to either of the 4sqM meetings and pose these questions to the Cherry Tree Estates development team. As I indicated there were 2 families from the Concha area at the 4sqM general meeting and they had their questions answered by us.

Tim VanMeter
303-888-5459
October 30, 2018  
Lance Wheeland, President  
Concha Townhomes Association

Dear Lance,

Your e-mail to me dated October 10 outlined 4 questions about the Cherry Tree Estates development at 1700 S. Quebec. Thank you for the compliments and kind words about my actions and development plan.

Your inquiry was proceeded by a series of e-mails from Lisa Forman to Arapahoe County. Obviously, Ms. Forman feels differently about my follow through and truthfulness. I assure you and the Concha homeowners that I have done everything to the letter of the law working with Colorado State, Arapahoe County and Denver County regulatory agencies. There has been no attempt to hide facts or to mislead anyone. This is a very complex project not to mention that there are multiple agencies from the state level down to the two counties that need to be dealt with. The good news is that Concha is no longer adjacent to a dump site producing high levels of methane. The name calling, and accusations made by a very few individuals has not been productive nor does it encourage cooperation. As these people sit on the Concha board, I would ask you to stop them from further negative behavior. I asked for the Concha concerns to be written and you sent the following 4.

1. The fence between our properties.
   A. Joint maintenance agreement. Yes, I would like to enter into a joint agreement. Please have an attorney draw it up and I will have my corporate attorney review it.
   B. I won’t entertain paying for replacement of the fence. There is a long history of debris being thrown over the fence and laying up against the pickets and posts on my side. I cleaned this up for several years. I contacted the Board and the Management Co. to no avail and was forced to call the sheriff’s department to stop the littering. The posts and pickets that have rotted need to be replaced in those areas. You can assume that the fencing company will need to work from both sides to replace the fence and I will allow them to work from my side. Once the fence is replaced I will agree to a joint maintenance arrangement.

2. Will I pay for trees to be planted in Concha residents’ backyards?
   A. I will follow the rules and regulations set forth by the Arapahoe County Code. The landscape architect is working closely with Arapahoe County. Cherry Tree Estates will be landscaped above the minimum requirements and will be a fantastically beautiful senior living community. Cherry Tree Estates will enhance the neighborhood while keeping a watchful eye on conservation of our water resources.
   B. No, I will not pay for trees in Concha backyards.

3. Start date and end date.
   A. I assure you that no one wants this project to start any sooner than I do. Due to the complexities of the site, state and county regulations and the planning process required I have no start date for construction at this time.
   B. End date.
      Are you asking me to hurry up and finish? I don’t know when I’m going to start how can I commit to a finish date. The project will be built in phases and will be completed on a
time line that is dictated by me. It is in my best interest to complete it as soon as possible. I will work within the rules and regulations of the agencies that govern this site. I cannot agree to everyone's desire for my efforts to be silent, invisible and only on their schedule. The excavation and removal of 4000 + semi loads of buried municipal waste was completed ahead of schedule with the least amount of disturbance to the neighbors possible. Cherry Tree Estates is a large project and will take careful planning. As during the excavation process, I will remain available and willing to listen to concerns. I will work within the confines of the rules and regulations of the County. Cherry Tree Estates has already increased the values of your properties - you no longer have a dump in your backyard or look at a debris scattered field. Please extend a little patience while the construction takes place. Cherry Tree Estates will be beautiful and add value to the neighborhood.

4. Exit onto Quebec from Cherry Tree Estates.
   A. The Traffic Engineering Plan has been reviewed and approved by the City and County of Denver not once but three times. The TEP was designed by licensed engineers and then reviewed and improved by a second engineering firm. A traffic engineer performed a study on the traffic generated by Cherry Tree Estates and issued his professional opinion. Arapahoe County has also reviewed and approved the TEP. A traffic light would be costly and create a huge bottleneck for no reason. Do you really want slower travel times and more congestion on Quebec? Probably not, but please forward the name of your engineer who is questioning the viability of my approved exit. I will put them in touch with the professionals in Denver and Arapahoe County who approved this TEP.

I hope the above response answers your questions. Thank you for your interest in Cherry Tree Estates.

Sincerely,

Tim VanMeter
Molly,

I think the meeting went well last night. Low attendance. Three Concha members but none of our opposition. They mentioned the Concha HOA told them to attend 4SM and bring back information but that they were "over it". Lots of questions but no major concerns were expressed.

A Granville West member was present. Positive about the proposal. I asked for her contract information which is: Laurel Deltamer, ldswgal@msn.com, 303-669-3532. The management company is: Granville West HOA, 1699 S. Tremon St. #178, Denver, CO 80231.

All for now,
Melissa

--
Melissa Kendrick
Kendrick Consulting Inc.
727 Geneva St.
Aurora, CO 80010
303-725-1255
CHERRY TREE ESTATES
SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN
A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUADRANT OF SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST, OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE, STATE OF COLORADO

GENERAL NOTES:

ASSEMBLAGE 1. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to make any and all necessary extensions, improvements, and changes to said area as may be required or necessary to meet federal, state, and local codes and regulations.

2. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to develop said area in a manner consistent with the approvals and standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

3. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

4. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

5. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

6. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

7. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

8. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

9. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

10. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

11. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

12. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

13. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

14. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

15. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

16. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

17. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

18. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

19. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

20. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

21. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

22. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

23. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

24. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

25. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

26. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

27. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

28. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

29. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

30. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

31. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

32. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

33. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

34. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

35. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

36. Owners, developers and/or successors of the specific development plan herein approved are expressly authorized to construct a drainage system, including but not limited to a drainage system for the purposes of protecting the public welfare, health and safety, in accordance with the standards and regulations of the various regulatory agencies governing said area, including but not limited to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
CHERRY TREE ESTATES
SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN
A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST, OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE, STATE OF COLORADO

NOTES
1. PARKING LOT LIGHTING SHALL BE PER ARAPAHOE COUNTY CODES.
2. PARKING LOT LIGHTING TO BE FURTHER DEFINED IN THE ADMINISTRATIVE SITE PLAN.
3. ALL UTILITY CROSSINGS IN THE DEVELOPMENT SITE PLAN SHALL BE SHOWN AS PERMITS FOR PROCESS.
4. ALL UTILITY CROSSINGS WITH A STORM SEWER SHALL HAVE A MINIMUM OF 18 INCHES OF VEGETATIVE CLEARANCE.

BASIS OF BEARINGS

SITE BENCHMARK
CITY STREET CORNER: A GRASS GAP AT THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF OASIS AND JEWELL, EB/81 Hurricane TO EB/82 BROADWAY

ANNOTATION LEGEND:
1. TRANSFORMER (TYP)
2. CONDUIT (TYP)
3. CABLE (TYP)
4. UNDERGROUND ELEVATION
5. ELEVATIONS
6. VERTICAL POWER
7. SEE SCHEDULE
8. PROPERTY LINE
9. STREET LIGHTS (TYP)
10. STREET LIGHTS (TYP)
11. FIREWORKS
12. FIREWALL
13. PUMPED END SECTION
14. FLOODING
15. FIRE PROTECTION ACCESS
16. GRASS INTERCEPTOR

SYMBOLS LEGEND:
1. WATER WEB
2. WATER MAIN
3. WATER MAIN
4. WATER MAIN
5. WATER MAIN
6. WATER MAIN
7. WATER MAIN
8. WATER MAIN
9. WATER MAIN
10. WATER MAIN
11. WATER MAIN
12. WATER MAIN
13. WATER MAIN
14. WATER MAIN
15. WATER MAIN
16. WATER MAIN

ABBREVIATIONS:

CASE NO. SDP18-002

CHERRY TREE ESTATES - SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN
CHERRY TREE ESTATES
SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN
A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 21,
TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST, OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
COUNTY OF ARAHAROE, STATE OF COLORADO

BUILDING ELEVATIONS TO BE FURTHER DEFINED UNDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE SITE PLAN PROCESS

CASE NO. SPD18-002
CHERRY TREE ESTATES
SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN
A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 21, TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST, OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE, STATE OF COLORADO

BUILDING ELEVATIONS TO BE FURTHER DEFINED UNDER THE ADMINISTRATIVE SITE PLAN PROCESS
CHERRY TREE ESTATES
SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN
A PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF SECTION 21,
TOWNSHIP 4 SOUTH, RANGE 67 WEST, OF THE 6TH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN,
COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE, STATE OF COLORADO

CHERRY TREE ESTATES - SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN
CASE NO. SDP18-022

ISSUE DATE - 1/18/19
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WATER METER

SCALE: 1" = 40'-0"

LANDSCAPE PLAN
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METAL FENCE WITH BRICK COLUMNS

6' HEIGHT PRIVACY FENCE

LIGHTING NOTE:
ALL LIGHTING WILL BE DOWNCAST AND SHIELDED