



Staff Communication

File #: PC Resolution 02-2022, **Version:** 2

Agenda Date: 07/25/2022

Subject:

PC Resolution 02-2022: Approving the Master Development Plan - Conceptual (MDP) for Aspen Grove

Prepared by: Justin Montgomery, Senior Planner
--

PURPOSE:

To consider an application for a Master Development Plan-Conceptual for the property located at 7301 S. Santa Fe Drive to terminate the existing PL-O and utilize the underlying Corridor Mixed (CM) zoning.

PRESENTATIONS:

Staff Presenter: Justin Montgomery, Senior Planner

Additional Presenters: Colby Young, VP of Asset Management, Gerrity Group (Owner)
Jessica Alizadeh, Attorney, Fairfield and Woods

SUMMARY:

The applicant seeks approval of a conceptual Master Development Plan (MDP) for the Aspen Grove shopping center to redevelop areas of the overall site in accordance with the underlying CM zoning to include a new mixed-use building with multifamily apartments above ground level retail, structured and on-street parking, new retail/commercial buildings, common open space, private streets, and pedestrian/bicycle amenities. The proposed plan shows 481 dwelling units in the southeastern portion of the site adjoining the RTD Mineral Station Park & Ride and allows an overall cap of 1,966 dwelling units on the property provided sustainability incentives are met.

PRIOR ACTIONS OR DISCUSSIONS:

- Last year, under the old code, Aspen Grove applied for a PD zoning amendment to allow potential redevelopment of the shopping center to include residential uses, such as retail below and apartments above.
- City council approved the zoning amendment in November 2021. A group of citizens petitioned to reverse the decision.
- In February of 2022, council voted to send the issue to the ballot on November 8, 2022. Until then, the decision on the zoning amendment is suspended.
- Council rezoned the city and adopted a new zoning code in October 2021.

Aspen Grove applied for a Master Development Plan in March 2022 to terminate the existing PL-O and utilize the new underlying zone district for the property, CM, which allows some residential uses, such as apartments.

ANALYSIS:

MDP-Conceptual Application

Staff is supportive of the owner's efforts to include a mix of residential uses within the property, offering an

opportunity to modernize the development consistent with the purposes of the CM zone district as stated in the Unified Land Use Code (ULUC) and approved by city council through legislative rezoning in 2021. Chapters 3 and 9 of the ULUC established content, design principles, and decision criteria for MDPs which staff applied to frame the analysis. The applicant indicated that if redevelopment of the retail center occurs, there is some potential that they may only build the first phase of the MDP-which proposes 481 residential units in a mixed-use building. If this is the case, it is unclear which, if any, improvements the owner may make to the existing site to assure connectivity and safe, effective vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation within the site, particularly to W. Aspen Grove Way. Vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation and connectivity are critical to several review criteria for MDPs.

One additional condition that staff proposes is the removal of Note 3 on Sheet 1 which implies that all future improvements will require a site plan. Staff recommends removal of the note because there may be some improvements to the existing retail development which do not require site plans, such as tenant finishes, and the note may create confusion. Therefore, staff recommends approval of the following additional condition:

1. Note 3 shall be removed from Sheet 1: Cover Sheet and Notes.

The applicant agrees to remove note 3 from Sheet 1.

Proposed Conditions

Staff proposes the following condition to support connectivity in any phasing scenario:

1. At Site Plan application, applicant shall provide clear, safe and complete vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation from Area A to the existing transportation system in and around the existing Aspen Grove development as required in the Master Development Plan and said connection shall be provided with the first phase of development.

Staff informed the applicant of this condition. Since the MDP is conceptual, the applicant is not inclined to commit to a specific roadway alignment on the MDP. They have indicated that the circulation from the new phase of development to Aspen Grove Way will be provided with their site plan application-which is required for the proposed mixed-use building.

Referendum

In 2021, the property owner submitted an application to amend the General Planned Development Plan (GPDP) which was ultimately approved by city council. Pursuant to the city's Charter, petitioners gathered enough signatures to have council reconsider the application and either repeal it or refer the matter to the registered electors of the city. In February of 2022, city council decided to refer that question to the voters at a special election to be held on November 8, 2022. Further, pursuant to the city's Charter, the ordinance that approved the Amendment was deemed suspended and would not be effective unless voters elected not to repeal the ordinance. Pursuant to ULUC 10-1-1.2.A(D)(1)(d) the ultimate approval of an MDP would have the effect of terminating the existing PD potentially rendering the outcome of this ballot question moot.

Council Goal, Objective, and/or Guiding Principle

- Goal 2, Financial Sustainability, Objective 2: Revenue Diversity
- Goal 6, Housing and Livability, Objective 1: Housing Diversity

Fiscal Impacts

Staff agrees with the applicant's analysis that adding residential uses to the existing retail center will provide greater long-term stability and viability to the retail revenue sources.

Alternatives

The commission may approve the proposed resolution containing conditions recommended by staff or may approve a resolution with no conditions, amended conditions, or additional conditions.

If the proposal is not approved, the owner may use the property under the existing provisions of the planned development zoning or may reapply for a MDP after one year from the final decision. The applicant could reapply within the one-year period of time so long as the application was not deemed to be the same or substantially similar to the original application.

Planning commission decisions are subject to a 30-day appeal period. Any appeal would be heard by council for a final decision.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

In staff's opinion, the proposed MDP will comply with the approval criteria in the Littleton City Code Section with the conditions contained in proposed PC Resolution 02-2022.

PROPOSED MOTION:

I move to approve PC Resolution 02-2022 approving the conceptual MDP for Aspen Grove concerning 7301 S. Santa Fe Drive, with conditions as stated in Section 1 of the resolution.

REFERENCES :

Corridor Mixed-Use Building and Site Design

<https://online.encodeplus.com/regs/littleton-co-cc/doc-viewer.aspx#secid-3676>

[<https://online.encodeplus.com/regs/littleton-co-cc/doc-viewer.aspx>](https://online.encodeplus.com/regs/littleton-co-cc/doc-viewer.aspx)

Master Development Plan Procedures

<https://online.encodeplus.com/regs/littleton-co-cc/doc-viewer.aspx#secid-3301>

[<https://online.encodeplus.com/regs/littleton-co-cc/doc-viewer.aspx>](https://online.encodeplus.com/regs/littleton-co-cc/doc-viewer.aspx)

Application and Supporting Documents (Development Activity List)

[<https://data.littletongov.org/pal.php?project=MDP22-0001>](https://data.littletongov.org/pal.php?project=MDP22-0001)

CITY OF LITTLETON, COLORADO

PC Resolution No. 02

Series, 2022

**A RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF
LITTLETON, COLORADO, APPROVING A MASTER DEVELOPMENT
PLAN-CONCEPTUAL FOR ASPEN GROVE**

WHEREAS, Title 10, Chapter 9, Section 10-9-5.7 of the Littleton City Code provides for the creation of a Master Development Plan; and

WHEREAS, the property (the “Property”) more specifically described in Exhibit A (Legal Description), which is attached hereto and fully incorporated herein by this reference, is zoned CM/PL-O, as part of the Newton Property General Planned Development Plan adopted by Ordinance 7, 1996, as has been amended over time; and

WHEREAS, On March 24, 2022, the owner of the Property, Aspen GRF2 LLC, applied for a conceptual master development plan; and

WHEREAS, the planning commission of the City of Littleton, Colorado held a public hearing on July 25, 2022, to consider the Aspen Grove MDP Conceptual Plan more specifically described in Exhibit B (“the Plan”), attached hereto and fully incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, the planning commission considered evidence and testimony concerning the Plan at said public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the planning commission finds in fact that the Plan is laid out in an efficient manner relative to the natural and built environments and designed to achieve the aims of a compact, highly walkable environment; and

WHEREAS, the planning commission finds in fact that the placement, arrangement, size, and relationships of buildings relative to streets, pedestrian and civic spaces, and one another create an urban environment within the Plan, and

WHEREAS, the planning commission finds in fact that the design or buildings and hardscape and landscape areas within the Plan help to establish visual interest, aesthetic appeal, and a unique identity for the development including human-scale amenities, integration of civic spaces for public interaction, and protection from the environmental elements; and

WHEREAS, the planning commission finds in fact that the connections within and between buildings, civic spaces, parking areas, transit stations and stops, and to surrounding development, and the proximity of origins and destinations both internal and external to the development shown within the Plan are such that walking and bicycling are safe and viable modes

of transportation; and

WHEREAS, the planning commission finds in fact that together with the developed areas, the undeveloped spaces devoted to natural resource preservation, buffering of uses, and for passive and active use shown within the Plan are connected and continuous throughout the development; and

WHEREAS, the planning commission finds in fact that the streets shown within the Plan are designed for multiple purposes, including vehicular movement, on-street parking, and safe use of pedestrians and bicyclists, and the parking is well-distributed and designed to preserve an urban streetscape; and

WHEREAS, the planning commission finds in fact that the Plan will not create any significant adverse impacts on stormwater management facilities or the natural environment including water, air, vegetation, and other environmental features; and

WHEREAS, the planning commission finds in fact that the design shown within the Plan is not likely to result in nuisances including, but not limited to, noise, dust, light, or vibrations; and

WHEREAS, the planning commission finds in fact that development shown within the Plan is phased in a manner that assures an adequate mixture of residential and non-residential land uses, as applicable, and allows for transition from the early phases to completion, relating to the intensity of uses and parking; and

WHEREAS, the planning commission finds in fact that development design shown within the Plan is consistent with crime prevention through environmental design requirements of the Littleton City Code.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF LITTLETON, COLORADO, THAT:

Section 1: Approval. Pursuant to its authority under the provisions of the Littleton City Code and the City of Littleton Charter, the planning commission hereby approves the conceptual master development plan more specifically described in Exhibit B with the following conditions:

1.1 At Site Plan application, applicant shall provide clear, safe and complete vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation from Area A to the existing transportation system in and around the existing Aspen Grove development as required in the Master Development Plan and said connection shall be provided with the first phase of development; and

1.2 Note 3 shall be removed from Sheet 1: Cover Sheet and Notes.

Section 2: Execution. The planning commission hereby authorizes the execution of

signatures of Exhibit B following the completion of all stated conditions upon the effective date of this resolution.

Section 3: The planned development overlay or PL-O for the Property shall be hereby terminated, with all subsequent development subject to the standards of the Corridor Mixed zoning district in conjunction with the provisions of the approved master development plan shown in Exhibit B.

Section 3: Severability. If any part, section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase of this resolution is for any reason held to be invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the validity of the remaining sections of this resolution. The planning commission hereby declares that it would have passed this resolution, including each part, section, subsection, sentence, clause or phrase hereof, irrespective of the fact that one or more parts, sections, subsections, sentences, clauses or phrases may be declared invalid.

Section 4: Repealer. All resolutions, or parts thereof, in conflict with this resolution are hereby repealed, provided that this repealer shall not repeal the repealer clauses of such resolutions nor revive any resolution thereby.

INTRODUCED, READ AND ADOPTED at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Littleton, Colorado, on the 25th day of July, 2022, at 6:30 p.m. at the Littleton Center, 2255 West Berry Avenue, Littleton, Colorado.

ATTEST:

Wendy J. Shea-Tamag
DEPUTY CITY CLERK

Craig Coronato
CHAIR

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Reid Betzing
CITY ATTORNEY



EXHIBIT A
LEGAL DESCRIPTION

A parcel of land being situated in the south ½ of Section 29, Township 5 South, Range 68 West of the 6th principal meridian, City of Littleton, County of Arapahoe, State of Colorado being more particularly described as: Lot 1, Block 1; Lot 1, Block 2; and Lot 1, Block 3 of Aspen Grove Subdivision recorded January 26, 2001 at Reception No. B1011229, in Book 191, Pages 73-74, except that portion conveyed to the Department of Transportation, State of Colorado by Special Warranty Deed recorded December 27, 2004 at Reception No. B4221287, comprising 32.7 acres, more or less.

ASPEN GROVE MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Littleton, Colorado

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

Lot 1, Block 1, Lot 1, Block 2, Lot 1, Block 3,
ASPEN GROVE SUBDIVISION, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT THEREOF RECORDED JANUARY 26, 2001 AT RECEPTION NO. B1011229, IN BOOK 191 PAGES 73-74,
EXCEPT THAT PORTION CONVEYED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, STATE OF COLORADO BY SPECIAL WARRANTY DEED RECORDED DECEMBER
27, 2004 AT RECEPTION NO. B4221287, COUNTY OF ARAPAHOE, STATE OF COLORADO.

NOTES:

1. The MDP shall satisfy all ULUC requirements so that applicant and its successors in interest shall be entitled to all of those rights and privileges afforded under the ULUC as use by right within the Corridor Mixed-Use (CMU) zoning.
2. Any new development outside of Areas A and B will require an MDP Amendment prior to preparation of site plans.
3. Site plans shall be required for any new improvements prior to issuance of building permit.
4. The residential portion of the site will offer a varied and robust option that is inviting and safe. Site lighting, landscaping, and public design elements will work in tandem to both offer dynamic programming and to keep residents secure at all hours.
5. Parking for Area A to be integrated as a structure to minimize additional surface parking, creating a more pedestrian-oriented public space.
6. The canopy coverage requirement of 15% will be met in aggregate over the entire proposed development. Canopy coverage to be measured by assumed mature tree canopy using local Colorado resources to determine anticipated growth at time of site plan submittal.
7. Buffers are planned for the Northern and Southern edges of the site, aiming to offer a more seamless transition with adjacent properties and creating new programmatic opportunities within each area.
8. Bike circulation will be designed so as to minimize or negate any potential cyclist/ pedestrian or vehicle/ cyclist conflict zones. This measure aims to create a safe and efficient multi-modal network for all site visitors.
9. The proposed site has the explicit goal of creating stronger connections with nearby natural amenities, such as South Platte Park, using the aforementioned proposed circulation.
10. Nuisance control measures may include but are not limited to: downlights selected to minimize light pollution, landscape buffers to mitigate visual clutter and noise, street oriented retail to increase site activation and public space visibility, the continuation of existing site security services, and heavy in-situ site elements to control points of vehicle access into public spaces.
11. Building/Street relationships and specifics related to Area A are intended to inform the design direction for subsequent areas. Future site plan submittals will offer greater specifics for that area and will further inform the desired character and intent of the remaining Areas to be developed if market forces allow.
12. Table 10-1-3.4.2 will be met in order to achieve proposed density. Inclusive of the 481 units in Area A, density across the entire MDP Site shall not exceed 60DU/AC.

VICINITY MAP:



SHEET INDEX:


- COVER SHEET AND NOTES
- CONTEXT MAP
- SITE CHARACTER
- STREET SECTIONS
- MASTER PLAN
- MASTER PLAN - 'AREA A'
- PHASING PLAN
- 'AREA A' INTERIM ACCESS & CIRCULATION
- ACCESS & CIRCULATION
- BIKE & PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION
- COMMON OPEN SPACE & BUFFER PLAN
- ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION PLAN

PLANNING COMMISSION:

APPROVED AND ACCEPTED AT A MEETING HELD
BY THE LITTLETON PLANNING COMMISSION ON
THE _____ DAY OF _____, 20____

PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR

ATTEST: CITY CLERK






A NEW INTERIOR DRIVE - CONCEPTUAL


N.T.S.

The relationship between streets, common open space, and newly proposed buildings will emphasize circulation while simultaneously creating places to linger and take in various amenities.





B STREET WITH PARALLEL PARKING - CONCEPTUAL

N.T.S.











ASPEN GROVE MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN
'AREA A' INTERIM ACCESS & CIRCULATION







ASPEN GROVE MASTER DEVELOPMENT PLAN
COMMON OPEN SPACE AND BUFFER PLAN

The existing Master Development Plan Area ("MDPA") is primarily covered with buildings, parking lots and back of house loading areas. Landscaping within the existing MDPA is limited to parking islands, a grassy area in the center of the area adjacent to a movie theater and landscaped areas on the edges of the existing buildings. As a part of the redevelopment of the MDPA the property owner will work within current code to either expand the existing regional stormwater facility that serves the MDPA or providestormwaterfacilitieswithinthelimits of the MDPA into compliance with current codes. Generally speaking, the initial and future phases of development will show a net decrease in overall impervious cover by addition of open spaces per code for the MDPAwhileprovidingenvironmentalbenefits related to stormwater management that are built in to current stormwater management and open space development practices. This will result in a net benefit for the MDPA and downstreamareasincludingSouthSuburban Park and the South Platte River.



Meeting Date: July 25, 2022

Planner: Justin A. Montgomery, AICP, Senior Planner

APPLICATION SUMMARY:

Project Name: Aspen Grove Master Development Plan-Conceptual

Case Number: MDP22-0001

Application type: Master Development Plan-Conceptual

Location: 7301 S. Santa Fe Drive
(West side of S. Santa Fe Drive, east of South Platte Parkway on both north and south sides of W. Aspen Grove Way)

Size of Property: Approximately 32.8 acres

Zoning: CM/PL-O (current); CM (proposed)

Future Land Use

Map Designation: Corridor Mixed-Use Character Area

Applicant: Norris Design, represented by Brad Haigh

Owner: Aspen Grf2, LLC, represented by Colby Young

Applicant Request: Approval of an application for a Master Development Plan-Conceptual for the property at 7301 S Santa Fe Drive (Case #MDP22-0001) to terminate the existing PL-O and utilize the underlying Corridor Mixed (CM) zoning.

PROCESS:

Pre-Application Meeting

March 3, 2022 – Administrative

Master Development Plan (Conceptual)

March 15, 2022– First neighborhood meeting

March 24, 2022 – Complete application submitted and fees paid

May 11, 2022 – Second neighborhood meeting

June 27, 2022 – Planning commission public hearing (continued at applicant's request)

➤ July 25, 2022 – Planning commission public hearing

The Master Development Plan (MDP) process was created through the recent adoption of the Unified Land Use Code (ULUC) and is described in [Section 10-9-5.7](#). The subject property is zoned Corridor Mixed/Planned Overlay District (CM/PL-O) and before future development can utilize the underlying Corridor Mixed (CM) zoning, an MDP is required. The effect of an approved MDP would

terminate the PL-O for the property, as described in [Subsection 10-1-1.2.A](#). This means that the rights to undertake and complete the development and use of said property under the terms and conditions of the amended GDPD now referred to as PL-O would no longer be in effect and the standards of the ULUC would fully apply for future development.

The applicants provided an MDP-Conceptual for the planning commission's consideration. The purpose of the conceptual plan is to describe and graphically illustrate a proposed development. It should show how the conceptual plan conforms with CM zoning district standards and will be applied to the site. The plan contains the required content described in the MDP section, cited above, and design principles required from Chapter 3 that is specific to mixed-use developments. Further discussion of this required content is detailed below. The approval of this MDP-Conceptual would allow the applicants to move forward with Site Plan applications, per [Section 10-9-5.4](#), that are consistent with the details of the Conceptual Plan and meet the standards of the underlying CM zoning district standards referenced in the ULUC.

LOCATION:

The subject property is located at the intersection of W. Aspen Grove Way and S. Santa Fe Drive and is commonly known as Aspen Grove. The vicinity map to the right shows the subject property between South Santa Fe Drive and South Platte River Parkway.



1. Vicinity Map from the Conceptual Plan

PROPERTY AND APPLICATION BACKGROUND:

Timeline


1996	Property annexed into the City of Littleton from Arapahoe County and zoned PD-I as the Newton Property
2003	Aspen Grove shopping center completed initial construction
2016	Aspen Grf2 LLC purchases Aspen Grove shopping center
Apr. 2021	The Gerrity Group, on behalf of Grf2 LLC, applies for the fourth amendment to the Newton Property General Planned Development Plan (GPD) proposing a mix of commercial and residential uses on the property.
Oct. 2021	City council adopted new zoning and a new Unified Land Use Code via Ord 24-2021.
Nov. 2021	City council approves the proposed fourth amendment to the GPD by Ord. 22-2021.

Dec. 2021	Citizens petitioned to repeal Ord. 22-2021.
Jan. 2021	City clerk certified that the requisite signatures for a referendum were met.
Feb. 2022	City council voted to hold a special election regarding whether the 4 th amendment to the GDPD should be repealed on November 8, 2022.
Mar. 2022	Norris Design, on behalf of Grf2 LLC, applies for the subject Master Development Plan (Conceptual) project per the MDP process adopted by the 2021 ULUC.

The property is currently used as an established, regional “open-air” shopping center. The approximately 32.8-acre property has approximately 268,000 square feet of commercial space, some of which is vacant. Current tenants include restaurants such as Ted’s Montana Grill, Panera, RICE Bistro, Chick-fil-A, Starbucks, major retailers such as New Balance, Lululemon, Apple, Verizon, Eddie Bauer, Tattered Cover, Yankee Candle, Pottery Barn, and other entertainment venues such as Alamo Draft House. To the north of the property is an established residential neighborhood called Wolhurst Estates, containing a mix of single family detached and attached homes. To the west of the property is the Berkshire Apartments development built in 2011 as part of the Aspen Grove property. The Berkshire Apartments are three-story buildings. To the south of the property is the Regional Transportation District’s (RTD) Mineral Avenue light rail station. To the east of the property, across S. Santa Fe Drive, are three established single-family residential neighborhoods: Southbridge, Sunset II, and Goldenwest. Features in near proximity to the property are the Carson Nature Center, South Platte River, and South Platte Park open space to the west.

APPLICATION DETAILS:

The applicant requests approval of a Master Development Plan-Conceptual to utilize the underlying



2. Sheet 5: Master Plan from the Conceptual Plan

CM zoning of the property. This Conceptual Plan envisions phased redevelopment on portions of the overall site to include a new mixed-use building with multifamily apartments above ground level retail, structured and on-street parking, new retail/commercial buildings, common open space, private streets, and pedestrian/bicycle amenities. The proposed plan shows a total of 481 dwelling units in the southeastern portion of the site adjoining the RTD Mineral Station Park & Ride. If this MDP is approved, the city can accept a Site Plan application for any new development project that is consistent with what is being shown on this conceptual plan. The city can also, without a site plan, accept any tenant finishes or minor alterations to any existing buildings with a building permit.

In summary, the most significant purposes of the MDP are to:

- Terminate the existing PL-O that govern the uses that can occur on the property and put into effect the underlying CM zoning for future development
- Allow the applicant to proceed with a Site Plan process ([Section 10-9-5.4](#)) for development projects consistent with the MDP process and CM zoning district

The applicant provided the following information not included with the packet, but is available for review on the [Development Activity List](#) under case number [MDP22-0001](#):

- Referral Comments and Responses
- Conceptual Drainage Report
- Traffic Impact Report
- Title Commitment
- Letter of Authorization
- Revised Economic Analysis

PLAN ANALYSIS:

The Aspen Grove MDP-Conceptual is a plan set comprised of 12 sheets which include the following: Cover Sheet and Notes, Context Map, Site Character, Street Sections, Master Plan, Master Plan - 'Area A', Phasing Plan, 'Area A' Interim Access & Circulation, Access & Circulation, Bike & Pedestrian Circulation, Common Open Space & Buffer Plan, and Environmental Protection Plan. There is one note, #3, on Sheet 1: Cover Sheet and Notes that staff will recommend removing as a condition of approval. This note contradicts the ULUC because there could be improvements that do not necessarily require a site plan, especially with existing businesses already operating on the site.

Traffic, Drainage, and Wildlife

The applicant provided a Traffic Impact Report prepared by Harris Kocher Smith (HKS) that was updated three times during the review process for this project. The report and city comments are available on the DAL for further reference. Staff recommends a correction to circulation concerns with the conditions of approval.

As a Transportation Oriented Development (TOD), adjacent to the RTD Mineral Station with multi-modal transportation options available, there is an expectation that this will reduce potential vehicular traffic volumes. The Traffic Impact Report provides projected traffic volumes and recommendations for improvements for the following nearby intersections:

- S. Santa Fe Dr./W. Aspen Grove Way
- S. Santa Fe Dr./W. Mineral Ave.
- S. Platte River Pkwy./W. Mineral Ave.
- S. Bryant St./W. Aspen Grove Way
- S. Platte River Pkwy./W. Aspen Grove Way
- S. Platte River Pkwy./W. Carson Dr.

- S. Platte River Pkwy./RTD North Parking Lot Access
- S. Platte River Pkwy./RTD South Parking Lot Access
- S. Santa Fe Dr./W. Nichols Ave. (assumed to be constructed by 2027).

Ultimately, the Traffic Impact Report was determined acceptable associated with the MDP (Conceptual). As site plans are submitted for development, traffic operations may need to be re-evaluated if any changes are made to the type of land use, amount of each land use, or location of various land uses.

Drainage currently runs through a regional detention pond located north and west of the property. With future site plans, imperviousness will be evaluated for any necessary improvements to either the property or the regional detention pond. Staff sent the proposal to Colorado Parks and Wildlife for review. The State had no concerns. Future site plans will be sent to Colorado Parks and Wildlife for review.

Master Development Plan Content

The ULUC outlines the required content and design principles for all MDPs. This provides a framework for the plan analysis. Under each requirement listed below, there is a description of where within the MDP that information is being provided and a brief analysis. The Conceptual Plan is provided as an attachment in the public hearing packet.

Content. Per Section 10-9-5.7, a Master Development Plan is required to illustrate the nature and character of development, including:

- a. Context. The context of the proposed development relative to adjacent development and the proposal for transitioning and buffering such development;*

Shown on Sheet 2: Context Map and Sheet 11: Common Open Space and Buffer Plan, the site is adjacent to the RTD Mineral Station Park & Ride to the south, single-family residential development to the north, multi-family residential development to the west, and Santa Fe Drive on the east. A buffer area is shown on the southern boundary of the property adjacent to Area A – the expected first phase of development.

- b. Location, Scale, and Design. The locations and types of residential, non-residential, and mixed land uses; their scale and design relationships; and methods to ensure compatibility between the various uses and adjacent lots;*

The Location, Scale, and Design is shown on Sheet 3: Site Character, Sheet 5: Master Plan, and Sheet 6: Phasing Plan. There are two areas in the phasing plan with no proposed limitation to the potential building heights, stating the maximum allowed (without a sustainable building design incentive) of 80 feet. Build-to and Shopfront Frontage Types as described in the CMU building block of the ULUC are shown on Sheet 3 to be used for Areas A and B.

- c. Density. Minimum and maximum gross densities, block sizes, lot patterns, and heights of residential uses;*

The proposed density is shown on Sheet 6: Phasing Plan. There is only one area of the plan, Area A, that is showing any residential development with a maximum of 481 units. This listed

maximum gross density of 60 dwelling units per acre (an achievable maximum potential of 1,966 dwelling units on the 32.78-acre property) apply to the overall site. This is somewhat consistent with the previously approved ordinance currently the subject of a referendum and ballot question (allowing a maximum of 2,000 units on the property) and is consistent with proposed changes to the ULUC regulations. Only 481 units would be allowed per the subject MDP-Conceptual and an amendment would be needed if more residential units are proposed in the future.

d. Intensity. Maximum gross floor areas, building coverage, and heights of non-residential and mixed uses;

Potential building coverage areas and heights of 80 feet (maximum) are shown on Sheet 5: Master Plan and Sheet 7: Phasing Plan. There were no limitations set on maximum gross floor areas provided in the MDP. As an existing commercial shopping center, staff does not have any concerns with this omission because the goal of the MDP is to allow residential uses in Area A.

e. Parking and Circulation. The proposed parking and circulation plans;

The proposed parking is illustrated on Sheet 3: Site Character, where the on-street parking is shown along the New Interior Drive, and Sheet 5: Master Development Plan, that shows the proposed parking structure in Area A. Surface parking will remain in large areas throughout the existing development. The proposed circulation is shown on Sheet 8: 'Area A' Interim Access and Circulation, Sheet 9: Access & Circulation and Sheet 10: Bike & Pedestrian Circulation. Staff requested Sheet 8 to evaluate what the circulation patterns could look like without the development of Area B. Staff concludes that a condition of approval to ensure that either the "New Interior Drive" or an alternative circulation route is constructed with the first phase of development is critical to the safety and function of the overall development.

f. Streets. The patterns, functional classifications, and cross-sections of streets within and adjacent to the development, along with the network of pedestrian and bicycle improvements;

This information is shown throughout the plan set with the more detailed cross-sections on Sheet 4: Street Sections. Since this is a proposal for infill redevelopment of an existing shopping center, the street layout and functional classifications are already established. The pedestrian and bicycle circulation is shown on Sheet 10: Bike & Pedestrian Circulation and Sheet 3: Site Character provides a conceptual view of the pedestrian improvements.

g. Common Open Space. General locations, means of continuity and connectivity, and the extent of common open spaces and amenities;

The common open space is detailed on Sheet 11: Common Open Space and Buffer Plan. There is street-facing open space along the eastern portion of the New Interior Drive and larger areas of open space further to the east. A potential plaza area between the future mixed-use building and the RTD Park & Ride is shown on the southern boundary.



3. Open Space Character Images, shown on the MDP

h. Environmental Protection. Sheet 12 contains an aerial image of the surrounding area with a statement related to environmental protection. The existing developed shopping center is mostly impervious surface. The design requirements for new development under the CM zoning district will add green-scape and require a tree canopy of 15 percent. Individual projects will be reviewed according to all city regulations, which includes the *Storm Drainage Design and Technical Criteria Manual*.

i. Phases. Phases and timing of development.

Shown on Sheet 7: Phasing Plan, two areas of development are included. Area A is in the southeast portion of the site, closest to the RTD Park & Ride, and shown as mixed-use with up to 481 residential units. Area B is to the north of Area A and consists of large common open space areas and retail/commercial buildings. Area A is the first phase of development and shows an estimated timing of 2027 (expected completion date) and Area B has an estimated timing of 2030.

Design Principles. Per Subsec. 10-3-3.2.B, a *Master Development Plan for a mixed-use development shall demonstrate adherence to the following design principles:*

1. Walkable Layout. Development shall be organized with block lengths that facilitate walkability or include provision for pedestrian accessways that shorten the walking distance between residential, commercial, and public and institutional uses within a mixed-use development.

The site contains existing pedestrian amenities as a shopping center and the proposed pedestrian circulation is an extensive grid throughout the development. Connection to the RTD Park & Ride is shown on the southern end of the site. Potential infill development will help to shorten the walking distances along the eastern side of the New Interior Drive.

2. Context-Sensitive Streets. Streets shall be laid out in a hierarchy with a main street and mixed-use and neighborhood connectors that tie into the existing street system to provide for continuity and good access as further defined in the Littleton Engineering and Design Standards (LEDS).

3. Parking. Parking shall be provided on-street to the maximum practicable extent and within parking lots or garages that are placed on the interior of blocks accessed from the side or rear of buildings or alleyways.

4. Connectivity. A pedestrian and bicycle system shall provide connections to peripheral sidewalks and trails and create both on- and off-street linkages tying together residential and non-residential areas, together with civic spaces, schools, transit stops/stations, and parks, in adherence with the LEDS.

The connectivity shown by the circulation plans in the MDP does not fully connect the site to adjacent development for all modes of transportation. There are portions of the existing shopping center that the applicant does not want to redevelop at this time. The New Interior Drive would improve the proposed connectivity and future amendments could help these conditions along S. Bryant Street and Aspen Grove Way.

4. Portion of Sheet 11: Common Open Space and Buffer Plan

The required common open space and tree canopy coverage will be provided throughout the development. The open space along the New Interior Drive will be connected to parking and activity areas.

7. Building/Street Relationship. Buildings shall be designed to relate directly to streets and located to create a sense of enclosure and a street environment rich with street-level businesses, amenities, and access to activity areas.

Areas A and B show the proposed building frontage types (build-to and shopfront) being used

by future development. There are maximum front setbacks within the CM lot and building standards that will ensure that buildings create a sense of enclosure. The uses proposed on street-level are all retail/commercial which will help activate the eastern side of the new interior drive.

8. Livability. Residential, non-residential, civic, and public transit uses shall related to one another to promote convenience and walkability. Areas designated as residential on a Master Development Plan may include a broad range of residential unit types and related accessory uses. The Master Development Plan may include residential land use sub-areas designating areas of different densities or housing types. Permitted uses are set out in Section 10-1-1.3, Land Use Matrix.

There is only one area, Area A, shown for residential development and it is proposed in the southeastern portion of the site closest to the RTD Park & Ride. The existing and proposed non-residential uses are conveniently located to the proposed multi-family residential use shown in Area A. The entire site promotes walkability.

REVIEW CRITERIA:

The planning commission may approve, approve with conditions or a deny an MDP based on the Decision Criteria listed in the Littleton City Code, Title 10, Section 10-9-5.7. The applicant provided their own analysis of how the proposed MDP meets the review criteria. The applicant's project narrative and decision criteria analysis are attached to the public hearing packet. Staff's analysis follows each of the review criteria detailed below.

1. Layout. The subject property is laid out in an efficient manner relative to the natural and built environments and designed to achieve the aims of a compact, highly walkable environment.

Working with an existing and active shopping center, the layout of the proposed MDP is showing efficient redevelopment and infill development that will help to create a more compact and highly walkable environment. The applicant is showing the Build-To and Shopfront Frontage Types along the proposed New Interior Drive with great pedestrian connection and common open space.

2. Building Form and Massing. The placement, arrangement, size, and relationships of buildings relative to streets, pedestrian, and civic spaces, and one another create an urban environment.

Staff encouraged the applicant to provide more information on the building form and massing. There are details within the applicant's project narratives and responses that are not shown on the MDP. The standards of the ULUC in Chapters 1 & 3, which future developments are subject to, will safeguard these elements and staff is comfortable with relying on the ULUC standards with future reviews. The building heights are proposed to maximize the allowances of the CM zoning district, but the applicant did not provide a visual analysis of what may be expected to be seen on this site. Staff is aware that this is a concern expressed by citizens.

3. Quality Design. The design of buildings and hardscape and landscape areas help to establish visual interest, aesthetic appeal, and a unique identity for the development

including human-scale amenities, integration of civic spaces for public interaction, and protection from the environmental elements.

The design of the buildings proposed is unclear, but the MDP states that the Build-To and Shopfront Frontage Types will be used in Areas A & B and building heights could be maximized. Staff is comfortable relying upon the standards within the ULUC because the plan is not providing any details related to the design of the buildings. The common open space provides areas for civic spaces and public interaction.

4. Walkability. The connections within and between buildings, civic spaces, parking areas, transit stations and stops, and to surrounding development; the presence of amenities and other pedestrian improvements; and the proximity of origins and destinations both internal and external to the development are such that walking and bicycling are safe and viable modes of transportation.

The MDP shows an enhanced pedestrian and bicycle circulation system. The New Interior Drive will be lined with common open space and amenities. Multimodal transportation options are being accommodated by the MDP, with its proposed connection to the adjacent RTD Park & Ride. Staff is not concerned with the overall walkability of this site, especially if the New Interior Drive or an alternative is constructed with the first phase of development.

5. Undeveloped Space. Together with the developed areas, the undeveloped spaces devoted to natural resource preservation, buffering of uses, and for passive and active use are connected and continuous throughout the development.

The MDP shows an adequate amount of common open space (undeveloped space) being added to the subject property. There is greenspace that is connected and continuous along the eastern portion of the New Interior Drive that does not currently exist in the shopping center parking lot and access drive. Buffering is shown on the southern portion of the site. The northern and western boundaries are current conditions expected to remain in place, at this time.

6. Complete Streets and Parking. The streets are designed for multiple purposes, including vehicular movement, on-street parking, and safe use of pedestrians and bicyclists, and the parking is well-distributed and designed to preserve an urban streetscape;

The proposed street sections show dedicated space for pedestrians and bicycles off the street. There is on-street parking shown on the east side of the New Interior Drive and a proposed parking structure in Area A. Overall, if fully realized, the MDP would help transform this shopping center to include a more urbanized and walkable streetscape than currently exists on the site. Staff is recommending a condition of approval that the New Interior Drive or an alternative is constructed with the first phase of development, and this would rectify staff's concerns on this decision criterion.

7. Effect on Natural Environment. The development will not create any significant adverse impacts on stormwater management facilities or the natural environment including water, air, vegetation, and other environmental features;

The Public Works Department reviewed the Conceptual Plan and did not have any concerns. The Littleton *Storm Drainage Design and Technical Criteria Manual* will be used to review future

development phases. The MDP shows more open space being added to the site than exists currently, and the applicant states that realization of this plan will decrease the existing impervious area.

8. Nuisance Mitigation. The design is not likely to result in nuisances including, but not limited to, noise, dust, light, or vibrations;

The proposed design is not likely to result in nuisances. Future lighting for the site will be subject to the ULUC's lighting standards. The design is not likely to create any additional nuisances related to noise, dust, or vibrations.

9. Phasing. The development is phased in a manner that assures an adequate mixture of residential and non-residential land uses, as applicable, and allows for transition from the early phases to completion, relating to the intensity of uses and parking; and

The Phasing Plan provided in the MDP shows two phases of development. This is an existing shopping center and an adequate mixture of residential and non-residential uses with the 481 dwelling units proposed. The timing shown for the completion of the two areas is 2027 for Area A and 2030 for Area B. Staff is not concerned with the phasing proposed as this was clarified during the review process and with the final Conceptual Plan presented.


10. Crime Prevention. Development design is consistent with Subsection 10-1-3.2.B, CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design)

The applicant states that they will continue to have site security and that the standards within the ULUC will be met with future Site Plans. Staff encouraged more details to be provided throughout the review of the MDP and the applicant did remove a pedestrian connection that could have contradicted these CPTED standards. Staff is comfortable relying on the ULUC standards in future reviews to satisfy this decision criterion.

NEIGHBORHOOD OUTREACH & PUBLIC NOTICE:

The applicant conducted neighborhood meetings on March 15 & May 11, 2022, virtually. There were 52 attendees at the first meeting and 32 attendees at the second meeting. Both meetings had a similar format, with a representative from the project team discussing the plans and showing some visual aids. The questions provided from the attendees were screened by the applicants, not visible to staff or other attendees, and either answered or dismissed by the applicant.

Mailed public notice of the public hearing was sent to all property owners and residents within 700 feet of the site within 10 days of the scheduled planning commission meeting. Notice of a public hearing was posted on the subject property and at city locations in advance of the planning commission hearing in compliance with the city's public notice requirements. The vicinity map below shows the location of the subject property (in hatched grey at the center of the green line) and the 700-foot notification boundary in a green line. Staff notified all properties shown with highlighting. In total, staff sent 738 notification cards to property owners and residents within the notification boundary.



Staff is aware of the public's concerns of the GPDP for the subject property that is the subject of the referendum in November. To date there have been three (3) written comments about the subject MDP provided to staff. All comments received will be provided in the public hearing packet or as handouts to the planning commission before the public hearing.

OUTSIDE REFERRAL AGENCIES:

Staff sent referrals to 18 outside referral agencies. There are no outstanding comments for the MDP (Conceptual). Additionally, all the outside referral agencies will be involved in the review of any subsequent development projects.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of proposed planning commission resolution number 02-2022 which contains the following conditions:

1. At Site Plan application, applicant shall provide clear, safe and complete vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation from Area A to the existing transportation system in and around the existing Aspen Grove development as required in the Master Development Plan and said connection shall be provided with the first phase of development.; and
2. Remove note 3 from Sheet 1: Cover Sheet and Notes.

If planning commission wishes to adopt a resolution recommending approval of the proposed PD amendment, planning commission should adopt Resolution 02-2022 as drafted, or with revised conditions.

NEXT STEPS

If the proposed MDP (Conceptual) is approved, additional approvals will be required for:

- Future Plats
- Site Plans
- Construction Permits (including grading and infrastructure)
- Building Permits

Approval of the proposed master development plan has the potential to make the outcome of the referendum irrelevant.

If the application is denied, the property owner may continue to operate and develop the property under the approved general planned development plan.

May 13, 2022

Revised: July 1, 2022

City of Littleton

Attn: Justin Montgomery

2255 West Berry Avenue

Littleton, CO 80120

Re: Aspen Grove Master Development Plan – Project Narrative

This Master Development Plan (MDP) is submitted in accordance with the Unified Land Use Code (ULUC) mixed-use corridor zoning requirements for the above-referenced property. The purpose of the MDP is twofold. It shall satisfy all ULUC requirements (as they exist as of the date of filing) so that Applicant and its successors in interest may be entitled to all of those rights and privileges afforded under the ULUC as use by right within the Corridor Mixed-Use (CMU) zoning. Second, it shall accommodate improvements in accordance with the ULUC to the Aspen Grove Shopping Center (Aspen Grove) anticipated by the Applicant in the near future, which is located within the MDP. Improvements may include: the addition of a new retail/commercial square; reconfiguration of existing facilities; enhancement of walkability; the addition of multi-family residential units; connection to multi-modal transportation; the addition of activated public and open spaces; connection to parks and recreation; beautification of Aspen Grove and improvement of the building/street relationship for customers, as well as current and future tenants; the addition of uses allowed under the ULUC; and all other improvements allowed under the ULUC.

The proposed Aspen Grove development is located south of downtown Littleton adjacent to S. Santa Fe Drive and the Littleton/Mineral Station RTD Stop, two key connections to the surrounding communities. The southern edge of the proposed development will serve as a functional public space and buffer. The goal is to facilitate an easily accessible connection to the RTD stop for both residents and visitors while also providing privacy and sound screening for the proposed mixed-use components of Area A. The property's northern edge will be composed of a 'natural' buffer that features pedestrian and bike paths. In this way, the adjacent uses will feel more intentionally and functionally connected to the property.

In line with the Authentic Guiding Principle of Envision Littleton, Area A of the proposed will be a mixed-use development comprised of multifamily housing, an activated first-floor retail level, and public plazas. The residential portion will offer a varied and robust residential option that is inviting and safe. The activated streetscape and pocket-plaza zones work to create a friendly environment and reinforce a human-scale approach to urban design. Site furnishings will add visual interest as well as serve

functional purposes. If market forces merit further development, public spaces in Area B will be designed with similar goals and characteristics in mind.

In line with the Connected Guiding Principle, circulation and parking for 'Area A' will be designed to emphasize the pedestrian scale of our public spaces. Proposed parking for the multifamily development will be integrated as a parking deck. Access will be provided from a newly proposed interior drive and a private drive to the east that doubles as a clear and functional fire access route. Retail parking will be designed based on projections of future tenants and anticipated users of proposed retail areas. Overall, pedestrian circulation will be prioritized by creating wide and accessible right-of-way sidewalks designed with the human experience in mind. An ample tree canopy will provide shade and meet the required 15% coverage while site furnishings and plaza attractions will set the pedestrian connections apart, making the final experience of walking across the site an enjoyable one. In addition to the pedestrian experience, bike circulation will be provided and regulated to avoid conflict with vehicles and pedestrians. Bike dismount zones will be clearly noted, with plenty of bike parking provided in convenient locations. Bike routes and dismount zones will be designed throughout Aspen Grove to facilitate a potential future connection to the nearby South Platte River bikeway.

In line with the Active Guiding Principle, common open space will be a design priority for the development. Plazas and pocket parks will be distributed throughout the site providing the required 15% open space while breaking up building facades and activating the outdoor space in a lively and meaningful way. Connectivity between each plaza will be thoughtfully choreographed to be safe and enjoyable. Programming examples for the plazas and streetscape include a variety of seating, bike storage, picnic tables, lighting, flexible green spaces, landscape, and artistic elements.

Finally, in line with the Engaged Guiding Principle, the proposed development will create a safe civic space. A neighborhood that has activity, walkability, and diverse options for work and play enriches the community experience. Lighting, safe streets, well-secured buildings, and vigilant management will help to ensure a quality experience for residents. On top of supplemental nuisance control measures offered through this MDP, Aspen Grove maintains a security patrol that will continue to service the entire property. These measures will be designed to ensure that all are welcome and can live and feel secure within the site.

Gerrity Group – Newton Property at Aspen Grove Community Meeting Notes

Date: 3/15/2022

Time: 6:00pm MT

Location: Virtual via Zoom Broadcast

Invitation: Sent by City of Littleton staff

Number of community Attendees: 52

Community Meeting Video Recording Link : <https://bit.ly/3NII14W>

Passcode: 0RLi*69h2I

Duration: 30 minutes

General Notes:

Brad Haigh of Norris Design led the discussion that mapped out plans for the future project and steps for the submission of the Master Development Plan under the ULUC. This plan addressed the Newton Property at Aspen Grove. Questions were submitted in advance at the request of the invitation sent prior to the meeting. Attendees were asked to submit questions and comments in advance via email at info@newtonmdp.com.

Questions submitted were related to the following:

- Timeline
- The current referendum of the original approved plan
- Design plans
- Residential plans
- Retail plans
- Height and Density of planned structures
- Grocers

Additional questions were answered live during the Q&A portion of the meeting.

Members of the community were encouraged to reach out to the applicant via email at info@newtonmdp.com.

First Name	Last Name	Email
Patrick	Navarrette	
Eric	Veith	
Diane	Gustte	
Emily	Dykes	
Lynn	Christensen	
Susan	Engleton	
Robert	Tann	
Debbie	Brinkman	
Tami	Friedrich	
John	Pojman	
Rob	Lee	
Edy Lynn	Burns	
David	Frazier	
Debbie	Reed	
Iftin	Abshir	
Jeanie	Erickson	
John	Reed	
kim	teresi	
Paul	Stranahan	
Patricia	Skarulis	
Richard	Youngkin	
John	Marchetti	
Paula	Freytag	
Andrea	Brown	
Justin	Montgomery	
Danielle	Magrogan	
Kevan	Hoff	
Cindie	Perry	
Don	Edwards	
Michael	Kolb	
Bill	Schwanitz	
Scott	Custer	
cheryl	bruns	
Margaret	Gordon	
Charlie	Blosten	
Charles	Ferris	
Paul	Marshall	
Alyssa	Campbell	
Jim	Zimmerman	
Holly	Shilliday	
Audress	Johnson	
Jen	Henninger	
David	Metcalf	
Deborah	Nicol	
Carol	Horton	
mike	goldberg	
Paula	Freytag	
Liz	Nedved	
Elizabeth	Franz	
Jonathan	Schmitz	
H P	Thomas	

Gerrity Group – Newton Property at Aspen Grove Community #2 Meeting Notes

Meeting Date: 5/11/2022

Time: 6:00pm MT

Location: Virtual via Zoom Broadcast

Invitation: Sent by City of Littleton staff

Number of community Attendees: 32

Community Meeting Video Recording Link : <https://bit.ly/3NIDq11>

Duration: 30 minutes

General Notes:

Colby Young of Gerrity Group led the discussion that mapped out plans for the future project and next steps for the submission of the Master Development Plan under the ULUC. This plan addressed the Newton Property at Aspen Grove. Questions were submitted in advance at the request of the invitation sent prior to the meeting. Attendees were asked to submit questions and comments in advance via email at info@newtonmdp.com.

Questions submitted were related to the following:

- Timeline
- The current referendum of the original approved plan
- Design plans
- Residential plans
- Retail plans
- Height and Density of planned structures
- Grocers

Relevant questions and responses are listed on page 2 of this document.

Members of the community were encouraged to reach out to the applicant via email at info@newtonmdp.com.

Community Meeting Questions & Responses

Below is a sample of questions received during the community meeting

Question: How many people were notified of this meeting and what was the criteria for someone to be notified?

Response: City staff is responsible for creating and mailing the notice by mail. Notice by mail, when required, shall be provided through the United States Postal Service (USPS) to all addresses, units, and property owners located within 700 feet of the subject property. City staff confirmed 735 notices were mailed.

Question: As a family community, will there be a playground for kids?

Response: As the details and decisions around amenities are considered we intend to be very community centric and support places to gather, play, relax, and enjoy.

Question: Is the open space for public use?

Response: The areas of plantings and open space will be able to be enjoyed by all.

Question: This diagram looks like you are getting rid of the Alamo for open space. Is that the case?

Response: No. The Alamo is open for business and will stay as an important amenity at Aspen Grove.

Question: How many notification were returned as undeliverable?

Response: The city did the mailing and any returns would have been received by them,

Question: Is the 481 units a reduction from the original plan?

Response: No. Area A was always planned as TOD mixed use. The units are what is allowed by the ULUC in relationship to the height.

Question: 80 foot, not to exceed 91 foot buildings are how many stories? How many of these buildings will be built? 80 ft. is approx seven stories.

Response: Our MDP shows one mixed use building of 80'. Future phases have not been planned or design at this point.

Questions: So the development shown tonight is under current zoning?

Response: Yes, this MDP is within the code requirements of the ULUC, adopted by the city.

Questions: How many people will be living on the whole property - A, B & C Areas?

Response: Currently the plan shows one multi-family building with 481 units in area A.

Question: What is TOD Response: Transit Oriented Development

Question: Will there be an anchor supermarket or grocery store?

Response: Grocers is one of the uses we would like to add to the center.

Question: What is the earliest date that changes immediately adjacent to S Platte River Pkwy might begin?

Response: There are no immediately changes planned adjacent to the South Platte River Parkway. This is a city road, not owned by Aspen Grove.

Question: Does the upcoming vote essentially grant permission to make any changes in the future that meet the new zoning rules?

Response: The ballot referendum is for a rezone under the current PD. The MDP application will be submitted to the city planning commission for approval of our immediate needs.

Question: What is the housing type(s) of the 481 units?

Response: Multi family.

Sent: Wednesday, March 16, 2022 1:51:42 PM

To: Kelly Milliman <kmilliman@littletongov.org>

Subject: Tuesday evening's Zoom meeting about Aspen Grove

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Kelly,

I attended the zoom meeting about Aspen Grove Tuesday March 15. I have been in touch with at least 25% of the zoom meeting attendees and we are aware the meetings are held by the applicant/developer, for the benefit of the applicant/developer. A zoom meeting is a pathetic way to reach out on an issue like this. There is no way to get a feel for the public's opinion of the proposal other than at an in person presentation. The City recommends to applicants that they hold the neighborhood meetings, but why do they not require public comment be allowed at the meeting. The developer tried to present a pretty picture/sales pitch, and got a count and names of who attended, which they will probably present to the City and claim that everyone in the audience loved the proposal, a few had questions. The exact opposite is true. At least 25% of us did not like the proposal!

Gerrity announced there were 49 attendees. Since they have our names and emails, why doesn't the city poll the attendees? How does the City recommend the citizens be contacted about a meeting like this and at what radius from the development does the city recommend?

Gerrity Group is proposing a Master Development Plan (MDP) process - apparently under the current Unified Land Use Code (ULUC).

The Master Development Plan process is actually new, part of the "streamlining" and "simplification" in the ULUC.

Is Gerrity Group trying to get their MDP through a Public Hearing **before** Community Development staff modify the Master Development Plan Code again, by June?

Because, FYI, City Development Staff is asking the Planning

Commission to approve a new 2-track "Master Development Plan" process, under discussion now, to pass by June - urgent. Yes, the new MDP was passed last October, but within 4 months staff has decided it must be quickly fixed/improved. **Why the urgency?**

At Planning Commission last week, Staff said they have "four" or "several" applicants who want to use the Master Development plan process [truth is they have to, because of size], so it is first on the list of "tweaks" that Community Development staff is trying to get Planning Commission to rubber-stamp, for inclusion in a June ULUC revision.

If Gerrity submits a MDP before then, they can probably work under the current ULUC. If it gets in after, they have to use that modification.

Why does everything seem so lopsided in favor of the Developers over the Public?

**I look forward to your response.
Thanks John**

* Sender and receiver should be mindful that all incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, S 24-72-200.1, et seq.

* Sender and receiver should be mindful that all incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, S 24-72-200.1, et seq.

* Sender and receiver should be mindful that all incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, S 24-72-200.1, et seq.

* Sender and receiver should be mindful that all incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, S 24-72-200.1, et seq.

From: [Harold Abney](#)
To: [Justin Montgomery](#)
Cc: [Gmail](#)
Subject: Add Me to email list
Date: Monday, June 13, 2022 2:52:49 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please add hrayabney to all emails regarding actions on the Aspen Grove development. I am AGAINST this development and several other large scale developments that are inappropriate for our little city.

Thank you,
Harold R. Abney

Littleton 80120

* Sender and receiver should be mindful that all incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, S 24-72-200.1, et seq.

Justin

I thought this issue was to be resolved by a vote of the population so wonder why the planning committee is continuing work on this. Can you explain? Please add me to your email and mailing list for this as my wife and I are opposed to the tall apartment building being proposed and potentially a hotel.

Thank you.

Paul

Paul Parish

Littleton CO 80120

July 19, 2022

Littleton Planning Commission
C/O Ms. Wendy Shea-Tamag
Deputy City Clerk
wsheatamag@Littletongov.org

Dear Planning Commissioners:

As you well know, over the past several years Envision Littleton worked toward the goal of correcting and enhancing our outdated development process. With the help of staff, council, boards and commissions, and years of public input, we collectively refined our planning concepts and assimilated “best practices” from other communities. The end result is our current ULUC, a community document that includes the input of all interested parties. It’s a strong, thoughtful document that should be our guide for years to come.

Littleton also has a housing study that shows a real shortage of affordable housing, and housing diversity. The study identified those shortages, as well as the fact that diverse housing, with wide ranges of sizes, types, and cost, develop a richer, more diverse and economically healthy community.

This community process is being tested at Aspen Grove.

As we all know, Aspen Grove has been declining for years. This is a life-stage problem, and one that’s best addressed by redevelopment. This presents a prime opportunity to address several issues, including adding quality housing that meets our diverse housing needs, retail repositioning, and importantly, the concentration of housing and retail near a major intersection that includes a major light rail station. This type of planning represents state of the art urban thought.

Change and innovation almost always bring opposition, but the Envision Littleton process assures us that these changes were shaped so that our present and future citizens and the city thrive.

I urge your approval of the proposed plan.

Truly yours,

Bill Hopping
Former City Council member

July 19, 2022

To: The Planning Commissioners – City of Littleton

I continue to hear that the public has not been or did not have the opportunity to be involved in the future of planning for the City. I respectfully have to disagree. The Envision Littleton four year process has given citizens many opportunities for input and involvement. This process has resulted in a Comprehensive Plan and a ULUC (Unified Land Use Code) that Littleton has needed for years. Just because some citizens don't agree with the results does not mean that they were not given the opportunity for input. I am in full support of the Master Plan Development for the Aspen Grove property on the ULUC. The code allows for the appropriate density and mid-rise height in designated corridor mixed-use areas like Aspen Grove. The height of a building in a mixed-use development will not change the character of Littleton. If Littleton is to move forward and meet the challenges of a changing competitive market, we cannot allow a small group to negatively influence development that meets the criteria of the ULUC.

Littleton is fortunate to have the amenity of a light rail station and the fact that it has never been developed as a TOD (Transit Oriented Development) is unbelievable. We now have an owner of Aspen Grove who not only needs to make changes so that Aspen Grove is successful not only today but in the future. This plan that will add housing stock, which we all agree, is needed as well as sustainable retail. The plan will have a positive sustainable economic impact on our City. The Gerrity Group are professionals with the knowledge and expertise to develop Aspen Grove into a vibrant place where citizens can live, walk to retail, enjoy the Platte River Trail and walk to the light rail station.

I ask you to approve the Master Plan submitted and allow the owner/developer to move forward so that we don't see a fence around Aspen Grove like the property at Federal and Bellevue.

Respectfully,


Kay Watson

Littleton, CO 80120

The following pages contain citizen comments received after the packet was released on Friday, July 22 and before 4:00 p.m. on Monday, July 25.

Dear Littleton City Council and Citizens,

06/27/2022

First let's get acquainted, my name is EmmaLee Archuleta. My boyfriend and I, we have been residents of Littleton for a year and a half. I have worked at Littleton public schools for almost a year coming October. Littleton has been a home to me for the last year and a half. We fell in love with this because it is a quiet town and not very many people. When we moved to Littleton it had bright potential for both of us. When we first moved here we scoped out the area. We knew Highlands Ranch was just south of us, Centennial and Lone Tree just east. Denver, north and just west Jefferson County. As we were scoping out the new land called our home we found this little place called Aspen Grove. We loved it, and we still love it. We get all we done there. I go to college, so if I need a book for school Tattered Cover is just five minutes down the road. If we didn't want to go too far for dinner: Chick-Fil-A, Ted's Montana, Panera, Rice Bistro, Noodles and Company and Qdoba were there ready to serve. Little toy shops and mom and pops are there to help you find the perfect gift for your families. Oh and the Alamo the Alamo Cinema is best way to catch a movie without going too far.

I would like to tell you a story. One night my boyfriend decided to go have sushi at Rice Bistro. When we finishing up the owner of the restaurant came up to us to ask us how our food was. He was telling us how proud his was to own this place. He owns two shops. TWO shops, one in the Aspen Grove area and the other in Castle Rock. I remember him saying he loves what he does and he wouldn't trade it for the world.

I have also been into All My Favorite Things, they are a mom and pop shop owned by a husband and wife. Everytime I go in there I know they love that shop and that's their pride and joy. That's the American Dream right there. Something to be proud of no matter how hard you worked for it, you know the effort and time was put in to these stores. Even if they are

considered big name brands or outlets. You don't know the story behind how that store got there. It started with a dream, and they made it happen. People put in their time and dedication to have an outlet store or their own shop. Now you're saying that we should take away all those mom and pops because of the fact that we are too overpopulated and the state of Colorado wants to make an extra 2 million dollars a year. Yet they keep saying that all of it is going to our schools and it's not. Trust me I work in the school system and I have had family members work in school districts and it's terrible. Where are families supposed to have some leisure time, when the closest movie theater is the Alamo, and you plan to tear that down for apartments that are going to make the housing markets sky high? What happened to protecting wildlife and help support small businesses? Everyone is going through hell right now, with inflation being the way it is and gas prices, these shops are the only source of income that maybe these families' have.

Let me paint a picture for you, let's say you or your spouses or children go a boutique shop or whatever that you loved so dearly. Then a couple months go by and your city decides we are zoning it for new houses. You are pissed off at the world right? That's how I feel and probably the majority of the people sitting in this room. You would probably sad and your heart is broken. So I would say put yourself in those shop owner's shoes, even though you might not be thinking about it because all you care about is money or just don't care at all. But damn these people have worked for what they got. I was raised in western Kansas I know how hard work works. I am standing up here to get across to the people sitting in these chairs taking notes that will probably get thrown away to say that if you tear down Aspen Grove you are making a huge mistake.

And if you did not get what all I have said, here's another recap for you:

- You are not supporting local small businesses
- You are going to raise the rent for the people who already live here

- You are ruining families leisurely activities
- You are going to be overpopulated
- You are not protecting wildlife or nature
- Your traffic in this area is going to be worse that means more stop lights

So please reconsider.

Thank you for your time.

Best Regards,

EmmaLee Archuleta

From: [Bruce Stahlman](#)
To: [Wendy Shea-Tamag](#)
Subject: Aspen Grove Public Hearing
Date: Sunday, July 24, 2022 5:04:18 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Wendy,

Hope you're doing well! I was out of town last week and unable to provide this earlier. Nonetheless, as a recent Planning Commission alumnus, I wanted to share my thoughts with the other Commissioners concerning the 25 July public hearing.

The Envision Process and Unified Land Use Code were extraordinarily impactful for the citizens and City reflecting substantial community involvement and vetting over an extended period of time such that an antiquated Comp Plan and Code have been brought up to date with 21st Century standards. We should be celebrating the fact that the developer is investing considerable capital and time to redesign their Aspen Grove project in accordance therewith.

Speaking plainly, retail properties need to be refreshed periodically to stay relevant in an extremely competitive ever changing environment. Otherwise, the market will pass them by as has happened with other shopping venues in the City. Aspen Grove's sustained economic impact is far too important to the citizens and the City to allow this to happen. Melding a destination shopping concept with on site residential units ensures Aspen Grove will continue to provide a vibrant retail experience that compliments Littleton's character.

Further as the first project to be vetted under the new process, Aspen Grove's corridor mixed use redevelopment is a critical opportunity to validate and bring to reality Envision Littleton's broad public input. It will serve as a touchstone for future redevelopment projects.

I encourage you to approve the revised plan accordingly.

Kind regards.

Bruce Stahlman

[REDACTED]
Littleton, Colorado 80120
[REDACTED]

* Sender and receiver should be mindful that all incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, S 24-72-200.1, et seq.

From: [Kent Bagley](#)
To: [Michael Sutherland](#); [Jennifer Henninger](#); [Wendy Shea-Tamag](#); [Justin Montgomery](#)
Subject: Proposed Aspen Grove Master Development Plan Amendment
Date: Monday, July 25, 2022 1:25:08 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To: Members of the Littleton Planning Commission
From: Kent Bagley, Former Chair Littleton Planning Commission and Former Director of RTD for District H
Subject: Aspen Grove Master Development Plan Amendment

As a resident of Littleton since 1994 and someone keenly aware of the past contemplated, proposed and actually implemented land use changes surrounding the Mineral Avenue RTD Light Rail Station and Park-n-Ride, it is my keen pleasure to see something positive proposed for the Aspen Grove shopping center.

Since Littleton has had the extensive Envision Littleton public process and adoption of the Unified Land Use Code, this is the first forward looking attempt to upgrade the Aspen Grove lifestyle shopping center into something that will bring about the potential of real mixed-use development with the new CMU zoning. Remember, Aspen grove was proposed as a lifestyle center, until the property to the west was rezoned for residential from commercial, now the Berkshire apartments, there was very limited residential integrated with the center. The development to the north already existed and is not integrated with Aspen Grove.

The 480-unit apartment project proposed with residential over retail will provide the opportunity for vertical mixed-use adjacent to the RTD Park-n-Ride with access for both pedestrians and bicycle users. This will allow for a more real Transit Oriented Development with possible changes to the uses on the RTD property in the future.

The proposed plan changes are consistent with the new Corridor Mixed-Use zoning and consistent with the Littleton Comprehensive Plan.

I urge the adoption of the proposed Aspen Grove Master Development Plan Amendment.

Sincerely,

Kent Bagley
Bagley Development Consultants

Littleton, Colorado 80120
Voice::

* Sender and receiver should be mindful that all incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, S 24-72-200.1, et seq.

Colleen Norton

From: Colin Campbell [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2022 8:36 AM
To: Sherri Almond; pcps@littletongov.org; Craig Coronato; Robin Hoadley; Dave McFadyen; Dan Miller; Jason Reynolds; pctn@littletongov.org
Cc: Colleen Norton
Subject: Tonight's Planning Commission Meeting

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Commission,

I am not able to attend tonight's meeting, but I would like my voice to be heard. I am **NOT** in favor of the redevelopment of Aspen Grove, as it is currently outlined. I have previously signed the petition to have this development put to the vote of the citizens of Littleton, but apparently, that is being circumvented.

Thank you for hearing my voice.

Sincerely, Colin Campbell

[REDACTED]
Littleton, CO 80120
[REDACTED]

* Sender and receiver should be mindful that all incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, S 24-72-200.1, et seq.

July 25, 2022

Dear Planning Commission,

Having watched recent Planning Commission meetings with interest, it seems doubtful that Commissioners have been able to give any but a seemingly polite response to residents objecting to what lies before them. For such public concerns appear to have only been routinely and roundly dismissed in favor of pleasing developers' wishes instead.

I had therefore concluded it was pointless to object to the Aspen Grove redevelopment initiative now under your consideration. And yet, what is proposed there is so out of character with immediate environs as well as other neighborhoods and publics that will be adversely impacted if you approve it—I cannot in good conscience simply say nothing.

Virtually every piece of rationale that has been advanced for densification of Aspen Grove is seriously flawed. I've spoken with dozens of people in the past several weeks who are absolutely furious that city hall is moving forward with this proposal. My time, and yours of course, only allows citing some of its most egregious elements:

- That the city needs greater density to accommodate growth projections is both artificial and irrational. It ignores that those projections are in part based on growth generated by recent urbanized developments the city has approved, it sidesteps awareness of growth occurring in other areas far more suitable, and it imagines that the city is not already fully-developed.
- To believe that new residents this proposal envisions will be served would use public transportation rather than drive is unrealistic. RTD's Transportation Oriented Development agenda is driven by Washington elites detached from the communities it adversely impacts. Plus, it's no secret that RTD itself is failing.
- The city claims the ULUC is based on its newly revised Com Plan, which was purportedly character-based. Yet the city combined "land use" with "character" in its "Future Land Use and Character" map for the city's major thoroughfares—including Santa Fe—which it labels "Corridor Mixed Use" (map adopted 10/15/19). No character there; it's *all* land use. Despite the former City Manager's claim that the ULUC is indeed based on character, for those subject zones, character was obviously ignored. This instead runs headlong into the character desires of Littleton's residents and those of other adversely affected publics.
- When others hear that the city's traffic engineer went on record stating the proposal would have no impact on traffic congestion, they laugh out loud—really! I've found no one outside city hall believing this proposal would not exacerbate traffic congestion at the dangerous Santa Fe-Mineral intersection.
- That Commissioners are considering this proposal's approval before having detailed plans and funding lined up for the proposed "quad loop" traffic workaround at that intersection appears to "put the cart before the horse". Plus, many residents and commuters understand this "solution" would actually reduce traffic flow.
- Last, but not least, tall structures proposed would block views of valued landscapes to the west. Adversely impacted residents and motorists consider it incredulous that the city would accept the developers' claim that this will not happen—especially, because no effort has apparently been made to actually consult with adversely impacted publics. Even just a short walk and talks would prove the developer's claim to be false.

If Commissioners continue to disregard and ignore such concerns and instead simply "rubber" stamp this proposal, how can it expect we the people to avoid considering it only a Development Commission? I'm submitting this in writing because there are much more than three minutes worth of factors to be considered before making your decision.

Don Bruns, District IV

Colleen Norton

From: Diane Campbell [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2022 10:24 AM
To: 'Colin Campbell'; Sherri Almond; pcps@littletongov.org; Craig Coronato; Robin Hoadley; Dave McFadyen; Dan Miller; Jason Reynolds; pctn@littletongov.org
Cc: Colleen Norton
Subject: Tonight's Planning Commission Meeting

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Commission,

I am not able to attend tonight's meeting, but I would like my voice to be heard. I am **NOT** in favor of the redevelopment of Aspen Grove, as it is currently outlined. I have previously signed the petition to have this development put to the vote of the citizens of Littleton, but apparently, that is being circumvented.

Thank you for hearing my voice.

Sincerely,

Diane Campbell
[REDACTED]
Littleton, CO 80120
[REDACTED]

* Sender and receiver should be mindful that all incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, S 24-72-200.1, et seq.

Agenda Item Comment

Littleton Center
2255 W. Berry Avenue
Littleton, CO 80120

Date Submitted:

July 25, 2022 10:24 AM

Council meeting date:

07/25/2022

Council agenda item number:

7(b)

Name

David Shahan

Email address

[REDACTED]

Neighborhood

South

Position

I oppose the issue

Comments:

Let me see if I understand the reasoning in this article: <https://littletonindependent.net/stories/battle-over-election-rules-spurred-by-housing-debate-takes-shape-in-littleton,397808> 1. The budget runs on tax revenue

2. The physical dimensions of the city of Littleton are fixed

3. Because other parts of the greater metro area that may not have fixed boundaries are growing in population Littleton must also grow in population to increase (1).

4. Car-dependent single family homes are too expensive for new families to own

5. This is why school enrollment is "rapidly declining"

6. Aspen Grove can support up to 2000 multi-family units which will attract "a diverse socioeconomic population"

7. These new residents will all have lots of kids who need to go to school

8. These new residents will all want to shop at Aspen Grove stores since they can walk there

9. These new residents will not need cars to go anywhere else, even to school

10. As all the old, childless folks who live in (4) age out, Littleton will develop plans to repurpose those neighborhoods into high density low cost housing for (1)

11. Don't question the motives of the city council

What am I missing?

Colleen Norton

From: JIM STIELER [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2022 3:04 PM
To: Sherri Almond; pcps@littletongov.org; Craig Coronato; Robin Hoadley; Dave McFadyen; Dan Miller; Jason Reynolds; pctxn@littletongov.org
Cc: Colleen Norton
Subject: Proposed Aspen Grove Development

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I wish to express my opposition to the proposed development at Aspen Grove. I not opposed to improving Aspen Grove in a manner that reflects reasonable aesthetics in terms of design and magnitude of structures. But, what I am seeing in proposed structures not only exceeds reasonable aesthetics with proposed seven or eight story structures, but results in a density of housing that is going to impact daily traffic on Mineral Avenue and side streets as well as accessibility within Aspen Grove for those visiting from outside the Aspen Grove complex of residences. the Phase 1 plan to develop the southeast corner of Aspen Grove appears to be only the beginning of a very imposing development that I don't feel is in step with what the City of Littleton should represents. Aspen Grove is not downtown Denver nor the Denver Tech Center, but is a small commercial area serving a residential community in the residential context of Littleton. I look at Littleton Village as an example of a development that is in the category of unreasonable aesthetics given the look and density of housing, and it is not even made up of seven to eight story structures. It is also interesting to note what was promised for Littleton Village to be and what it will end up being. Funny how what we are told will be in a development and what is actually constructed is no longer the same. That leaves me with little confidence that what is proposed and what will actually be built at Aspen Grove will follow the original plan development particularly given it is being done in phases. And this is on top of a base development plan that I am already opposed to.

I think what is happening with the ULUC is running amuck. Please step back and look at what this may be turning Littleton into.

Thanks for reading. I wish I could attend this meeting tonight. But I have volunteer commitments.

Jim Stieler

[REDACTED]
Littleton

* Sender and receiver should be mindful that all incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, S 24-72-200.1, et seq.

Colleen Norton

From: KRISTOPHER REARDON [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2022 7:20 AM
To: Sherri Almond; pcps@littletongov.org; Craig Coronato; Robin Hoadley; Dave McFadyen; Dan Miller; Jason Reynolds; pctn@littletongov.org
Cc: Colleen Norton
Subject: Planning Meeting July 25, 2022 Comments on PC Resolution 02-2022

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Planning Commission Members -

I am writing to you in regards to the meeting Monday, July 25, 2022 regarding PC Resolution 02-2022, the approval of a Master Development Plan at the Aspen Grove Site. I apologize I will not be able to attend the meeting in person as I am visiting family out of state.

I did fill out the comment section on the City of Littleton website but want to make sure the comments reach you directly, before the meeting.

I oppose the approval of PC Resolution 02-2022 and the applicants Master Development Plan.

The buildings are too high, the amount of residences too dense, and the traffic study horribly outdated, incomplete, and the impact laughably estimated incorrectly.

In addition, the process of this whole plan by the developer has been shady at best, borderline nefarious, and steeped in nothing but greed. To start their process one way, with an outgoing city council days within the 2021 election, and then when the citizens spoke up to oppose the action, they attempt to circumvent the voice of the people with this ULUC/MDP process undermines the entire voice of the community.

Progress and development is not the problem. Doing so in a vacuum without hearing from the community involved/affected by the development is the problem.

Please vote this approval down and have the developer start this process from the beginning, in a collaborative way with the surrounding community.

Thank you fo your time,

Kristopher Reardon
Heritage High / Jackass Hill area resident since 2013

To the Littleton Planning Commission
Re: Aspen Grove Revision to the Planned Development
July 25, 2022

I was a member of the Littleton Planning Commission in the late 90's that considered the zoning change to the Aspen Grove property. Originally the site was an open, undeveloped field next to the light rail station, adjacent to the Platte Greenway and had excellent access to two busy corridors. During public hearings at Planning Commission and Council debating the zoning change, there was vigorous opposition to the original Aspen Grove proposal for a retail and office center. Much of the opposition centered on:

- Loss of open space (even though this was private property)
- Too much traffic generation,
- A strain on overcrowded Mineral/Santa intersection,
- Danger to wildlife, not compatible with the Greenway,
- Blocking of views,
- Too intense a development,
- Not compatible with Carson Nature Center

Now years later Aspen Grove is held up as a beacon of a successful lifestyle center by much of the city and the retail must be preserved at all costs by excluding residential. Many of the same arguments against the original Aspen Grove proposal are now being recycled and used today in opposition to adding residential.

The Berkshire land behind the center is a part of the development and was originally slated for office use. There was a debate over what use was more compatible with the greenway. Was office use 5 days a week and quiet at night better than 7 days a week residential? Was this part of the site, buried behind the commercial development, appropriate and desirable for office use? The Planning Commission and Council approved the change to the PD, allowed for the 3-story residential development you see today. The Berkshire development set a **precedent** for allowing residential development on the site.

Due to changing of nationwide buying trends and lessen need for brick and mortar retail, Aspen Grove has become anemic. Adding additional housing will help to enliven the center with "fannies on site". As a comparison, one reason out of many that have lead to the lackluster performance of the former Cinderella City site and Streets Of Southglen is the lack of enough housing to help support the centers. Further, shopping centers are constantly changing to meet current shopping trends. Aspen Grove is now considered middle age due to atrophy, and in need of upgrading with new shopping opportunities along with a residential component. Doing nothing will further decrease all-important sales tax revenue the City relies on.

The location of the proposed residential on the southeast corner of the site will have the least impact on the surrounding residential and the Greenway. That end of Aspen Grove is 10' to 15' lower than the Santa Fe roadway, which will help mitigate the residential height. While there are valid reasons for and against the proposed height limit, there should be no disagreement over the need for additional variety of housing in Littleton. With Aspen Grove considered a Transit Adjacent Development, more intense housing nearby makes sense.

I ask that you approve, with any amendments you may have, the revised Plan Development for Aspen Grove allowing residential.

Mark Rudnicki

Agenda Item Comment

Littleton Center
2255 W. Berry Avenue
Littleton, CO 80120

Date Submitted:

July 25, 2022 02:07 PM

Council meeting date:

07/25/2022

Council agenda item number:

7(b)

Name

Carol Hidalgo

Email address

[REDACTED]

Neighborhood

Heritage

Position

I oppose the issue

Comments:

The proposed development at ASPEN GROVE allows for too many units and a undesirable height for the buildings.



Aspen Grove Master Development Plan MDP-Conceptual

Justin A. Montgomery, AICP
July 25, 2022

Purpose

- Applicant requests approval of a Master Development Plan - Conceptual
 - Allows up to 481 dwelling units in the first phase
 - No more than 1,966 dwelling units on entire property with sustainability incentives
 - Terminates the PL-O and requires adherence to the applicable Corridor Mixed (CM) zoning district standards
 - 80-foot maximum height
- Decision based on 10 criteria (Section 10-9-5.7)


Background

- 32.7 acres
- 1995-Annexation
- 2001 – 2003 Constructed
- 2016-Purchased by Aspen Grf2 LLC
- Oct. 2021-Adoption of ULUC and Zoning Map
- 2021 City Council approval of 4th Amendment to GPDP approved
- Jan. 2022 Petitioners obtained enough signatures to have Council either repeal the 4th amendment or send to voters.
- Feb. 2022 Council votes to send the question to the voters.
- Mar. 2022 Application received for MDP-Conceptual




Application Details

- Type: MDP-Conceptual
- Plan Set: 12 Sheets
- Two Areas-A, & B
 - Area A: Mixed-Use with 481 residential units over retail
 - Area B: Retail/Commercial
- Content:
 - Common Open Space
 - Pedestrian & Bicycle Circulation
 - Structured & On-street Parking



Neighborhood Outreach

- Two virtual meetings
 - March 15, 2022 (52 attendees)
 - May 11, 2022 (32 attendees)
- Development Activity List
- Public hearing notice
 - 738 notification postcards
 - Newspaper notice
 - Notice signs posted
 - City postings



Application Materials

- In PC Hearing Packet
 - Aspen Grove MDP-Conceptual 12 Sheet Plan Set
 - Staff Report with city analysis
 - Applicant's project & decision criteria narrative
 - Applicant's Neighborhood Meeting Summaries
- Found on the DAL
 - Review comments & responses
 - Traffic Impact Report
 - Drainage Report
 - Title Commitment
 - Applicant's Economic Analysis

Staff Analysis

Required MDP Content: Section 10-9-5.7	
Context	✓
Location, Scale, & Design	✓
Density	✓
Intensity	✓
Parking & Circulation	✓
Streets	✓
Common Open Space	✓
Environmental Protection	✓
Phases	✓

Required MDP Design Principles: Subsec. 10-3-3.2.B	
Walkable Layout	✓
Context-Sensitive Streets	✓
Parking	✓
Connectivity	✗
Open Space	✓
Resource Integration	✓
Building/Street Relationship	✓
Livability	✓

Staff Analysis

MDP Decision Criteria: Section 10-9-5.7	
Layout	✓
Building Form & Massing	✓
Quality Design	✓
Walkability	✓
Undeveloped Space	✓
Complete Streets & Parking	✗
Effect on Natural Environment	✓
Nuisance Mitigation	✓
Phasing	✓
Crime Prevention	✓

Recommendation

Staff Recommends Approval with the following conditions:

- 1. At Site Plan application, applicant shall provide clear, safe and complete vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation from Area A to the existing transportation system in and around the existing Aspen Grove development as required in the Master Development Plan and said connection shall be provided with the first phase of development; and**
- 2. Note 3 shall be removed from Sheet 1: Cover Sheet and Notes.**