

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS  
LITTLETON CITY PLANNING BOARD  
JANUARY 27, 2014

The Littleton City Planning Board met on Monday, January 27, 2014 in the Council Chambers of the Littleton City Center, 2255 West Berry Avenue. The meeting convened at 7:00 p.m.

**1. ROLL CALL**

Board Member David Bolt  
Chair Pro Tem Karina Elrod  
Board Member Carrie Moore  
Board Member Mark Rudnicki  
Board Member Curt Samuelson

**THOSE ABSENT:**

Board Member LaDonna Baertlein, Alt. 1  
Chair Randy Duzan  
Board Member Andrew Graham  
Board Member Edward Schroeder, Alt. 2

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Glen Van Nimwegen, Community Development Director  
Kristin Schledorn, Deputy City Attorney  
Dennis Swain, Senior Planner  
Anne Cecilione, Recording Secretary

**2. AGENDA**

No changes to the Agenda.

**3. MINUTES**

a. Approval of December 9, 2013 minutes as amended.

Motion to Approve December 9, 2013 minutes. Moved by Board Member Bolt, seconded by Board Member Samuelson.

Motion Carried 4-0

**4. SCHEDULED/UNSCHEDULED APPEARANCES**

**Paul Bingham, 236 W. Delaware Circle.** He expressed his thanks to the Planning Board for all of the hard work on the Comprehensive Plan. He also congratulated them on getting City Council to approve the Comprehensive Plan.

**Pam Chadbourne** resides at Crestline and Nevada. She expressed that she spoke at the December 9 meeting and went on line to see the draft minutes. She stated that when a citizen makes an unscheduled appearance and their comments are recorded, is it possible to review those and let you know whether we think our comments were accurately reflected or not? She was not able to find the draft minutes on line either.

**Board Member Bolt** interjected that he had made some comments at the meeting and they were not recorded either.

**Pam Chadbourne** stated that there is a link on the website for City Council's minutes but she was unable to find a link for Planning Board minutes.

**Board Member Elrod** stated that she understood that all meetings were recorded and maintained on line. She asked Mr. Van Nimwegen to elaborate on the length of time that the meetings were kept.

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** was not certain of the duration that the recorded meetings remained available.

**Board Member Elrod** stated that the recordings were another way that board members were able to revisit what was said in the meeting, but she reinforced that she thought it was a good idea to make sure that the context behind the comments were included. It is unreasonable to have verbatim minutes. Board member Elrod stated that the board does appreciate receiving prior written comments ahead of time.

**Pam Chadbourne** reiterated that she appreciates that there is a video record available; however, the advantage of a written record is that they are searchable. This is the first Planning Board meeting since the King Soopers PDO was approved. She stated that there are currently two new King Soopers stores being expanded. Federal and Belleview was just expanded to 76,000 sq. ft. which is like what was proposed at Littleton Blvd. and Broadway. Centennial at Mineral and Dry Creek has an expansion of 66,000 sq. ft. and it's a similiar kind of lot in a residential area with a main street nearby. Centennial is only a partial closure. Centennial offered Kroger no development assistance. So in Littleton there are a number of people who are dependent on that store, who walk to that store. We have a strong motivation to help the people who live have access to food and goods. She is very distressed that there was not a date of closure included in the staff report. She thinks it is wrong to not consider the people who are impacted by the closure especially when we have given a half million dollars of tax waivers/fee consideration to Kroger. She requested that the Board up the bar. If it's not included in the staff report, tell them to go find the information; you can always table to a later date until you get the information.

There is a lack of consideration to the impact on the community. She thanked the Planning Board for their consideration.

## **5. PUBLIC HEARING**

a. An Ordinance of the City of Littleton, Colorado, Amending City Code Sections 10-3-2, 10-4-7 and 10-8-2 allowing Outdoor/Open Storage in the Central Area Multiple Use District (CA) subject to Conditional Use approval

**Glen Van Nimwegen**, Director of Community Development, stated that the reason that staff was bringing forth this code amendment is because there is a conflict between one of the goals in the Downtown Neighborhood Plan which is that the Downtown Main Street and the streets that intersect it should be a location of civic events and the zoning code which does not allow outside storage. Our code is rightfully restrictive on outside storage of materials. It is only allowed in the B-3 district and industrial districts and only if that storage is completely screened by fences or landscaping. In Downtown, we have a situation because there are so many events that it's almost a year long process where things are being stored outside. The proposed ordinance will provide an opportunity for a public hearing so all the folks that would be affected by the allowance of the outside storage could be heard. It would give the Planning Board an opportunity to put conditions on the use. If the applicant doesn't meet those conditions, then staff may revoke the permit and ensure they cease and desist their use.

**Board Member Elrod** opened the floor up to board members for questions.

**Board Member Bolt** had a question on the termination period. He wanted to make sure that the Planning Board had the ability to put in dates that frame this permit and if they don't act on it in the event's time frame, which might be weeks, that it can be terminated then and not having to wait twelve months.

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** responded that staff put the maximum time, so you could go up to two years and allow the use according to a schedule. But it doesn't have to be two years, it can be less. The Board may want to do it initially for a short period of time and if the applicant follows the rules, maybe extend it again for a longer period of time.

**Board Member Bolt** asked if the Planning Board has the ability to add conditions, to say where their stuff can be stored or how things needed to be screened per the normal code?

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** stated that one of the things the city is requiring is the applicant to provide what they want to do and when. This allows the Board the discretion to limit the storage use in a number of ways.

**Board Member Bolt** asked how the screening that is required; how does that work? Does it need to be a certain height or visible from a certain level?

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** believed that it just had to be out of public view. Typically this is from the public right of way, the sidewalk that is adjoining the site. We have offered some other solutions to this particular property owner to put a certain amount of storage actually on City property. But there is a certain amount of stuff that is probably going to have to remain on site.

**Board Member Rudnicki** stated that with a conditional use we can tell them how things need to be stored; what needs to be screened; what is acceptable as a condition of the conditional use. We can also put a time limit on it. He expressed that he had a problem with the write up specifically the statement in the staff report that reads as follows: "visible from all perspectives". "Visible from all perspectives," you are kind of arguing against allowing storage, just by that slight phrase, in his opinion. In the next sentence, you speak about, subject to conditions "on a temporary basis", but all I see on time limits here is that this is basically permanent. It seems that once they're granted, they are forever.

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** responded that Board member Rudnicki's statement was not necessarily true. Two years is still considered temporary.

**Board Member Rudnicki** asked if it was a two year maximum for conditional use.

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** stated that two years is the maximum as stated in the draft, but it doesn't mean that you have to approve two years initially.

**Board Member Rudnicki** asked about the revoking or terminating the conditional use for reasons: "...failure to initiate operation of the conditional use within twelve (12) months". This seems quite long. He would think that something like six months or less would be more appropriate. If you don't use it right away then it goes away. Secondly, "discontinuance of the conditional use for a period of at least twelve (12) months", it seems quite long. Number four troubles him the most, "violation of, or failure to comply with, the approved conditional use after reasonable notice to comply has been given by the city." What is "Reasonable notice"? Why don't we put a time limit here instead of leaving so much wiggle room?

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** responded to the two questions. In establishing the use, we are being consistent to the nonconforming use section of the code. However, this is not part of this ordinance. We are not changing that section. Regarding the "reasonable notice to comply" is because ultimately the revocation may go to court and we have to go through a process of giving them notice to make the case stick when it goes to court. They always have the right to a hearing before the judge.

**Board Member Rudnicki** stated that you have to provide a legal remedy here if you're trying to revoke his conditional use. He didn't feel too bad about the times now because of the fact that we can put a time limit to each conditional use if we so desire along with location, screening, etc. whatever we feel comfortable in granting with the conditional use.

**Board Member Moore** wanted to make sure that she understood the process. If a business owner has a big event coming up in October, she comes in and asks for this conditional storage use and would like it for the next two years from September 1 to November 30 for storing her stuff outside. For that same period of time for the next two years, she can do that assuming that the board votes and says that here's the parameters?

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** agreed with Board Member Moore that the tough part will be getting enough detail out of the applicant. You approve it and then you don't see them for another two years. Then they have to come back to renew it and it gives you an opportunity to see their record. Did they follow the rules all the way along? If so and you haven't got a complaint, then perhaps you approve it for three years from that point.

**Board Member Moore** asked for clarification regarding the time frame; you can go beyond that two year limit?

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** stated that the first time you see it, you cannot go beyond two years, but when they come back for renewal, you have the potential to go longer.

**Board Member Samuelson** asked for those annual events, you can give someone a pass for three, four, five years without them having to come back again?

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** responded that was a correct statement.

**Board Member Samuelson** stated that many of these events have been happening for some time. Has there been a complaint from some other business owners that has caused this to come about? Have we gotten other input from business owners?

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** responded that yes, that complaints have been received from other business owners. We do get complaints and if you read our code they cannot be doing this. Then it is a matter of taking them to court. We do realize per the Downtown Plan and per the history of Littleton, that Downtown is an event center and there is not a lot of vacant properties in the Downtown. This is an opportunity for a Public Hearing to air surrounding business owners concerns and hopefully we reach a middle ground.

**Board Member Samuelson** asked if there were any other properties that were having issues with storage on a short term basis.

**Deputy City Attorney Schledorn** responded that there have been some issues with the sidewalk areas with storage out on those areas in the front of these buildings. There should be an ordinance coming out shortly to address this issue.

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** stated that this issue was actually in the right of way and another section of the code. That is kind of related in that merchants have putting items out in front of their store for sale. Our code strictly says that you cannot do that in the right of way. What we have done

is provide a draft ordinance to city council that says that per certain standards that you could put things for sale in the right of way.

**Board Member Samuelson** asked if there was a particular business owner who had perpetual events throughout the year, would it be in our right to say that he could only have a certain number of events per year?

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** stated that the events themselves are not subject to this conditional use only allowing the storage. This ordinance provides an opportunity to work with their business plan, the city's goal of having events downtown and hopefully meet the neighbors' expectations.

**Board Member Samuelson** asked if there were any other ideas of ways to alleviate this issue?

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** responded that the store owner could put permanent screening in place, though outdoor storage is not allowed in the CA district.

**Board Member Rudnicki** stated that we could make screening a part of the conditional use, right?

**Deputy City Attorney Schledorn** stated that if they were to provide a shed, then they wouldn't need a conditional use because it would comply with the outdoor storage.

**Board Member Rudnicki** asked if they could approve a trailer in lieu of outdoor storage.

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** responded that a reasonable condition may be approved for an initial period of time and we want a more permanent solution before a request for renewal.

**Board Member Moore** stated an example. She has a reoccurring event, Halloween, year after year, for a period of two years I can come to the Planning Board and ask for this conditional use for this outside storage during this period of time for September through November. What that precludes or the challenge that we potentially face is if there are complaints. We do not have an opportunity to change that for that second year. Is that correct? Because we've approved a two year period for this outside storage, is that correct?

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** responded that yes, if they are meeting the conditions of the approval, it is lawful for the allowed period of time.

**Board Member Elrod** stated that they would be meeting code because the Planning Board approved it.

**Deputy City Attorney Schledorn** interjected that you can do shorter time periods so that they are coming before you more frequently. Staff has the ability after notice to revoke the permit at which time they have to come in and reapply to you and at that point you would have the opportunity to ask the applicant why was it revoked and how can you assure that it won't be revoked again?

**Board Member Elrod** asked what would be the conditions to cause it to be revoked?

**Deputy City Attorney Schledorn** responded that it would be failure to comply with the conditions that you put on the permit.

**Board Member Elrod** stated that they would be complying, it's just that we learned something new.

**Deputy City Attorney Schledorn** clarified that it was something that wasn't initially thought of?

**Board Member Elrod** responded that yes that was correct. On the point that we have an event every month, essentially that becomes a permanent outdoor storage and right now we're giving temporary a time frame of two years but it can be extended to another year. So essentially, it becomes a permanent situation. On Section 2, Line 4, under City Code 10-4-7, it says that it's amended to read as follows, are you removing Sections B, C, D and E where it's written under now?

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** responded that those sections would remain. All that we're adding are the words that are all in caps in Section A.

**Board Member Elrod** opened this up for public hearing (7:39 pm)

**Pam Chadbourne** resides at Crestline and Nevada. She lives close to Downtown and she paralleled her experience in residing in Pasadena which hosts the Rose Bowl Parade to the city. She stated that Pasadena does not allow outside storage. She doesn't understand why the city is considering changing the ordinance for one individual. It is in the interest of Downtown to screen the kind of stuff that is currently being stored.

A motion to approve an ordinance of the City of Littleton, Colorado, amending city code sections 10-3-2, 10-4-7 and 10-8-2 allowing outdoor/open storage in the central area multiple use district (CA) subject to conditional use approval was made by Board Member Rudnicki, seconded by Board Member Elrod.

**Board Member Samuelson** proposed an amendment to Section 3-R-1 to change the conditional use shall be granted by the planning board initially for no more than one year. Subsequent conditional use approvals may be granted for longer periods. The motion was seconded by Board Member Rudnicki.

**Board Member Elrod** stated that she thought the concerns here was that something that should be temporary becomes permanent and the challenge that we're facing is how do we define temporary? Is it two years? One year? Because essentially changing this to one year, you can still potentially see stuff for the whole year. Through the Conditional Use, we are asking for a specified time. She stated that she would actually amend it to eliminate "initially it shall be two years" completely. The language that she recommends is as follows: "the conditional use shall

be granted by the planning board for a specified time period.” Board Member Samuelson accepted this change to his motion.

**Board Member Bolt** asked if this essentially opens up the door to make it longer than two years? One year? Three? Five?

**Board Member Elrod** replied that she thought that it potentially could open up the door for that.

**Board Member Bolt** believes that there is a tremendous amount of flexibility in this amendment and we can put any time period that we want. We can always make it shorter and if we make it with no time limit, we can still make it shorter. However, if we put no time limit that leaves the possibility of someone opening it up for a longer period of time. Do we want to open that to future boards to make it more permanent?

**Board Member Elrod** withdrew her amendment.

**Board Member Elrod** stated that they were voting on an amendment to the motion to change the ordinance to read as follows: “The conditional use shall be granted by the planning board for a specified time period, which, initially, shall be no more than one year. Subsequent conditional use approvals may be granted for longer periods.”

The motion was carried 4-1 with Board Member Moore voting against.

**Board Member Elrod** stated that they were going back to the main motion as amended. Motion to approve Resolution recommended to Council changes to the attached ordinance for requirements for outside storage in the CA district as amended.

**Board Member Moore** stated that she didn't want to be a storage baby sitter. She thinks that if people have a storage issue they should solve it. Whether they have to add a shed, etc. Even though it benefits us as a community with these events, her position is that there are other ways to solve the problem.

**Board Member Elrod** stated that she thought that what this was trying to address what truly is temporary. If you have one event a year that runs for a month and an investment to accommodate that from a permanent basis.

**Board Member Moore** asked if the city had something to offer in terms of storage space where these events may be promoted by the city where they can store some of these things so it doesn't fall on the merchants.

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** stated we have offered to store some trailers that are owned by the Merchants Association offsite at the city's yard.

**Board Member Elrod** asked if it was a conflict if we go back to R1 if it reads for continuous use not to exceed three months. If its for an extended period of time, it is no longer a temporary



issue, it is a permanent issue that we want them to solve on their own. Does that language help address some of your concerns, Carrie?

**Board Member Moore** expressed a concern on how many times are we going to see the same person coming back asking for a request when there is more important business for the Planning Board.

**Board Member Rudnicki** stated that if there is a problem with the Ordinance that we bring it up again and delete the whole thing and go back to the good life prior to approval.

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** stated that one of the benefits of the conditional use is that they are not establishing a permanent use, they are only getting it for that period of time so as Commissioner Rudnicki said if the ordinance changes, they have it until the end of that period and then it goes away.

**Board Member Elrod** stated that she knows that we're honing in on one particular situation, she does think that we want to create the opportunity for other retailers or other organizations to bring more events to downtown so it does give them leeway or opportunity, we are not precluding them for doing that because of the challenge they have with outside storage.

**Board Member Rudnicki** stated that the outdoor activities/events, closing of Main Street, is fantastic. It keeps things active. He would like to promote that along with the needs of an adjoining business who is looking at the pile. That's what we tried to do with amendment, with enforcement, as well as time periods.

Motion to approve the resolution recommending the city council approve the draft ordinance as amended to reduce the initial approval time frame to one year was 3-2 with Board Members Moore and Samuelson voting against.

## 6. GENERAL BUSINESS

### 7. COMMENTS/REPORTS

#### a. Staff Discussion of process to amend the neighborhood plans - Dennis Swain

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** reiterated that Council approved the Comprehensive Plan with some minor changes. Dennis Swain will go through the changes that they had. Mr. Van Nimwegen stated that he knew that the full board wasn't present, so perhaps this needs a little more detailed conversation. We can start talking about the neighborhood plans. The reason that this was put on the Agenda is that the Chairman wanted to talk about the process, primarily about how we amend the citizen process. We are tentatively scheduled for the Board to meet with the City Council on February 25, so perhaps this is a topic of conversation for that meeting. We do have another Board Meeting before that so we can get into a little more detail.

**Board Member Rudnicki** asked if they would be receiving hard copies of the updates that Dennis was making to the Comprehensive Plan.

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** assured the Board that they were in the process of amending the map and a couple of other things. However, the Board would receive any updates.

**Mr. Swain** stated he wanted to go through some of the minor changes. Two particular changes that the Council made regarding the neighborhood plans are: Introduction, Page 7, changing priorities and adding two corridors. Council added Mineral and County Line to the list of corridors that they would like to see plans for. They also want to revise the map which shows the corridors and the neighborhoods. Those two things will be done. On page 2 of the Handout, you can see where the amendments will be. On page 3 of the Handout is the small area plans matrix. (this was presented to City Council with the priorities). Page 4 shows that the priorities for the Neighborhood plans were changed from Medium to Low. One exception to that is the Neighborhood Plan for Progress Park which they wanted to go from Medium to High; the second exception is that they left TrailMark as a Medium priority.

**Mr. Swain** responded that there is a lot going on in the Prospect neighborhood; there is a lot of change and a lot of potential; and that activity needs more coordinated direction. The reason for keeping TrailMark a medium priority is that, although the plan that we have for it is really not a neighborhood plan, the neighborhood is almost completely developed and we don't see or anticipate a lot of changes. There is a recognition that we have to develop a real neighborhood plan, but there aren't huge issues facing the neighborhood at this time. Under corridors, City Council added County Line and Mineral. They put both of the new corridors as Low priority; they left the others as they are. Under Activity Areas, with one exception, they left all those as they are. The one change was the area around the intersection of Broadway and Littleton Blvd. They assigned a High priority to this Activity Area in order to make the priority for the Activity Area consistent with the priority for working on the Broadway and Littleton Boulevard corridors.

**Board Member Elrod** asked which corridors we have a grant for?

**Mr. Swain** responded that we have two grants, one for Littleton Boulevard, which is primarily for the Littleton Downtown Light Rail Station Area and the second grant is for the Mineral Light Rail Station Area. We are hoping to expand both of those studies beyond the station areas to include at least a portion of the corridors.

**Board Member Rudnicki** asked if we could stretch the grant to do all of the Littleton Boulevard Corridor.

**Mr. Swain** responded that financially it would be a stretch, but the way the grant proposal was written, it was a possibility. We are not certain how far we are going to get with the money we have allocated. It may be that we don't do the entire length of the corridor, but we only do certain elements of it. For example, we may want to do an inventory of the existing structures.

**Board Member Elrod** stated that she would really like for us to figure out a way for all of the Littleton Boulevard Corridor to be covered. She thinks that's that the study needs to be more comprehensive.

**Mr. Swain** responded that the 2015 study could be the first of several studies.

**Board Member Rudnicki** asked if a tandem study could be done. We will be doing the Light Rail Station area study, which will include at least a portion of Littleton Blvd. Could we at the same time do a second study that addresses the rest of Littleton Boulevard? The grant will only cover a certain amount, but we should be looking at all sections of the corridor at the same time.

**Mr. Swain** responded that the grant is pretty open ended. The language would allow us to go all the way to Broadway if we wanted to. But if we study the entire corridor, how much are we realistically going to be able to accomplish with any one element of the study?

**Board Member Elrod** asked how do we plan around how we are going to use that money considering we want to try to cover everything?

**Mr. Swain** responded that when the grant proposal was written, we had some ideas coming out of the Downtown Plan of what we should study along the corridor. Then, there were specific requirements for the grant itself; there are certain things that you have to do. There has to be a transportation element and there has to be a market study that's done for each of the areas that you are looking at. So we accounted for those and looked at what similar projects have cost. There is also a cap on the grant funding.. We have budgeted for the 80/20% match required by the grant. If the Littleton Boulevard Corridor study isn't initiated until 2015, there is a potential that we could ask city council for additional funding in the 2015 budget.

**Board Member Rudnicki** asked what the Mineral Station grant included.

**Mr. Swain** responded that includes the Ensor property, the large animal clinic property, the RTD site, and then we are also going to explore how much of the corridor we can do as well. It also includes the Aspen Grove shopping center.

**Board Member Rudnicki** asked if the fact that we have grant money for those two areas means that Littleton will be hiring outside consultants to help us write the studies ?

**Mr. Swain** responded that is the intent. We will get expertise that we do not necessarily have in-house. For example, we would look at consultants to produce a parking program, urban design framework, and a wayfinding program; i.e. elements that we could use assistance with.

**Board Member Rudnicki** stated that by bringing in outside help, it would help us achieve things quicker.

**Board Member Elrod** asked what the time frame was.

**Mr. Swain** responded that Mineral will be initiated in 2014, Littleton Boulevard in 2015. Mineral would coincide with ULI doing a technical assistance program for the Mineral Station Area this spring, so there's a lot of things going on that make sense in the timing of it. Funding won't be starting later in the spring due to the Federal shut down a few months ago. It has all been delayed a bit.

**Board Member Rudnicki** asked if it was the intent to do one at a time; one per year.

**Mr. Swain** responded that was the type of discussion that he and Glen wanted to have with the board. On page 5 and 6 of the handout, we put together some ideas of how we may want to approach it. We looked at the priorities that City Council assigned as Low, Medium, and High. The question at hand is does that also reflect on how much time and energy each of these require and the time frame? We need to look at and determine if there are issues that we need to deal with as citywide, not individually, neighborhood by neighborhood. Also, are there clean-up items that we know we need to be doing? Not necessarily doing substantive work, but editorial changes and then taking those back to Planning Board and City Council. That is a pretty easy process. We think that we can do that in-house and leave the draft edits on-line long enough to assure adequate time for public review. We also have multiple social media sites, so we have the potential of getting the word out for having people look at it. There was a lot of confusion during the citywide planning process since the neighborhood plans were not being redone at the same time. We may get more confusion as we take on the neighborhood plans. The second neighborhood plan that we will address, TrailMark, will require a little more work since TrailMark has never had a true neighborhood plan, one that was developed through a public process that included the existing neighbors. We will get into issues we might not see in other places, such as wildlife and wildfire mitigation. Additionally, other agencies may be more involved, so that may be a little more work. There are service issues more than land-related issues. In that case, we think the planning process needs more public outreach and working with the HOA (homeowners association). The HOA provides a real opportunity because that is the one neighborhood that is covered by a single HOA, so it should be fairly easy to work with them to coordinate the public outreach.

**Board Member Bolt** added that he believes there have been issues with coyotes in the neighborhood.

**Mr. Swain** noted that City Council identified updating the Progress Park neighborhood plan as a High priority. He continued that Progress Park is more complex than other neighborhoods in terms of the complexity of the stakeholders in that neighborhood. Updating the neighborhood plan gets complex because of the diversity of the stakeholders, their interests, the changes the neighborhood is experiencing, and what the city and neighborhood would like to see in the neighborhood. The Progress Park plan will require a more extensive public outreach program and will be more complex than what we've historically done. Together, these factors will require more time and effort than would be allocated to a more typical neighborhood.

What **Mr. Van Nimwegen** and **Mr. Swain** were hoping to discuss was whether it seems reasonable to set a hierarchy that focuses on first getting the low hanging fruit (which are generally the neighborhoods with the fewest issues) and whether that meets everyone's needs as we're trying to move ahead with the station area and corridor studies?

**Board Member Rudnicki** asked if it was Mr. Swain's intent to do one corridor a year and do some infilling with some other items? If not, we'll be twenty years out flushing out the comprehensive plan.

**Mr. Swain** responded that the Mineral Station and Littleton Downtown station area plans are scheduled. The Mineral and County Line corridors are Low priority and may not require plans. But we certainly need revised plans for Santa Fe, Broadway and Littleton Boulevard. so those become much more urgent in terms of getting them done. The typical neighborhoods are less urgent, with the exception of Progress Park. So we will try to do multiple plans at one time; for the corridors we'll use consultants as well as in-house staff. Those are going to be a large effort on the part of the staff as well as for the consultants.

**Board Member Elrod** stated that from a process perspective this makes sense. Can you give us a sense of a time line? Even by looking at the low priority neighborhoods, do you think it can be completed by 2014?

**Mr. Swain** responded that yes, he believed so but we don't know what else is going to come up in terms of possible funding or new issues and questions. For 2014, the goal is to complete the clean-up of the low priority neighborhood plans and get them through Council.

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** stated that the low priority neighborhood plans are the low hanging fruit and we think we can plow through those. It may appear that because we're doing them first they must be a high priority. To help avoid this type of confusion, we may need a matrix of priority and complexity. Because most of the neighborhood plans are low complexity, we think we can accomplish them quickly. It's kind of counterintuitive the way it's stated in the plan.

**Board Member Elrod** stated that she realizes that but she's looking at Mineral Station. So you are working on a pretty big project in conjunction. It makes sense that getting the Low Priority accomplished first makes perfect sense. There is a lower level of effort while balancing a highlevel project. The one other thing I wanted to comment on is that Jerry Valdez asked a question of Michael Penny about how is this going to dictate staff's goals, timelines, etc. I guess I'm asking that same question. The process looks right, but how does this dictate your work flow and how is that planning going to happen so that it will dictate our involvement as well? Will that happen?

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** answered that a work plan must always be flexible because other things happen. So that's how we're thinking right now. I like how you put that the High priority plans are the ones that we have funding for or a time limit, so staff has restrictions on what we can do.

With our current restrictions, the main stations and the neighborhood plans are scheduled to be done in two years, but he was unable to give a whole lot more detail than that.

**Board Member Elrod** stated that we should lay out that schedule and revisit it two years from now. We should continuously update it, so we know that's our charge for the next two years. If something happens that might change the schedule, then we will have a discussion and the public will be aware of what we're striving to accomplish.

**Mr. Swain** stated that we sometimes receive advance notice on what grant money is going to become available. But it's not a given, so we seize those opportunities when they're available.

**Board Member Rudnicki** asked if we foresaw any possibility of slipping in other corridor studies other than the two main ones.

**Mr. Swain** responded that he didn't think so. Broadway is going to be complex. It is almost two separate corridors. The north and the south are so distinct in some ways that there's an awful lot to deal with. City Council is very supportive of doing Broadway and Littleton Boulevard. Both need plans.

**Board Member Samuelson** asked if the Progress Park neighborhood includes Littleton Boulevard all the way to the railroad tracks. Wouldn't it make sense to work on this as part of the Boulevard corridor study also?

**Mr. Swain** responded that although the boundaries for each study will be distinct and will not overlap, the studies have to relate to one another. You really have to look at the adjoining neighborhood, its land uses, and how they affect one another.

**Board Member Samuelson** asked if Mr. Swain saw any of the neighborhood boundaries changing.

**Mr. Swain** responded that the neighborhood planning process will be an opportunity to revisit the boundaries. We will be looking at adjoining neighborhoods and amending boundaries as it is appropriate. The Progress Park neighborhood, for example, is very different from east to west. Ideally, should it remain a single neighborhood or should it be two?

b. Board Members

**Board Member Elrod** had a couple of follow up questions to King Soopers. Is there a date yet of closure?

**Mr. Van Nimwegen** stated that he was not aware of a closure date.

c.. Chair

None.

8. ADJOURN

Motion to ADJOURN Moved by Board Member Elrod, seconded by Board Member Samuelson.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:16 pm

---

Glen Van Nimwegen, Secretary to the Planning Board

---

Anne E. Cecilione, Recording Secretary