



Denise Ciernia &lt;dciernia@littletongov.org&gt;

---

## Bellevue Corridor resolution

---

**Loretta Lohman** <lorettalohman@gmail.com>

Mon, Jun 11, 2018 at 2:04 PM

To: David Bolt <pcdb@littletongov.org>, John Bridenbaugh <pcjb@littletongov.org>, Jason Reynolds <pcjr@littletongov.org>, Mark Rudnicki <pcmr@littletongov.org>, Bruce Stahlman <pcbs@littletongov.org>, Robin Swartzbacker <pcrs@littletongov.org>

Cc: Denise Ciernia <cddjc@littletongov.org>, Peggy Cole <pcole@littletongov.org>

To: Littleton Planning Commission

June 11, 2018

1:40 p.m.

Due to the short notice and lack of public hearing I am unable to attend tonight's meeting. However, as one of the citizens in immediate proximity to Columbine Square and one who attended every public meeting and open house on the Bellevue Corridor and subsequently spent hours proving comments, I would hope you take these comments with due consideration.

First, I do not believe we have a real Bellevue Corridor plan. We have a mishmash of ideas and visions with a serious lack of contemporaneous economic or marketing study input and no broad based community input. I read through the entire document more than once and I do not see any actual plan. Nor do I see that any on the ground homework has been accomplished.

For example, street parking for existing apartments is already a serious issue, to the point there is none available for proposed additional high density development. Irving Street is not equipped to handle both sides of capacity street parking as it is a major entry road to Centennial Acres and Kassler as well as to the Centennial Academy.

The actual traffic burden is alluded to but not addressed and there is no recognition that Lowell and Bellevue have become major alternatives to Santa Fe and Bowles with ever increasing traffic and few controls.

Again, there has been no real on the ground research in the Riverside Downs shopping area. The documents repeatedly state that the parking lot is underutilized. I am there every day at various times from early morning to late afternoon. I can categorically state that the parking is not underutilized during daylight hours.

It bemuses me that you are so eager to vote on a document that does not yet resemble a plan. It alarms me that you are willing to voice support for redevelopment that has no plan available for any review and that require a zoning change, apparently based on a developer/owner's word. It is flat ahistorical that you are willing to even consider something for urban renewal when no effort has been made to actually work with the public or, at least on the public record, with the city planning department. If you know any history you will recognize just how well past urban renewal efforts have been in Littleton and how costly they have been to the city. How can you expect better from a developer/owner who has not cooperated for the last 5 years.

It is not unreasonable for this neighborhood to wish to avoid the significant and community changing impacts that are occurring in areas of Denver. The schools, parks, roads and water systems will be severely compromised by approving plans that are thus far invisible.

Finally, it should be your ethical and fiduciary duty to serve first the citizens of Littleton, particularly those most impacted by the decision you seek to take tonight. At the very least you should move to a well-advertised public hearing before taking any vote. To quote Judge Damon J. Keith, "democracy dies in darkness."

Please use your authorities wisely.

--

Loretta Lohman, PhD  
303-549-3063



Denise Ciernia &lt;dciernia@littletongov.org&gt;

## Belleview Corridor Concept: please Table and Fix

**Pam Chadbourne** <ChadboLittCO@ecentral.com>

Mon, Jun 11, 2018 at 3:28 PM

To: David Bolt <pcdb@littletongov.org>, John Bridenbaugh <pcjb@littletongov.org>, Jason Reynolds <pcjr@littletongov.org>, Mark Rudnicki <pcmr@littletongov.org>, Bruce Stahlman <pcbs@littletongov.org>, Robin Swartzbacker <pcrs@littletongov.org>

Cc: Denise Ciernia <cddjc@littletongov.org>, ChadboLittCO@ecentral.com

For the Littleton Planning Commissioners;

regarding tonight's Agenda Item 5a, PC Resolution 14-2018, "Resolution recommending city council action on the Belleview Avenue Corridor Plan":

Please vote to Table this to a Date Certain, to accomplish specific fixes to this proposed document.

For your consideration, these are some fixes I believe are essential, before it advances to City Council for action:

1. Change the name from "Plan", to "Concept" or "Study", or something that conveys the true nature of the document.

- This document needs a much clearer definition of measurable Outcomes and Impacts in many areas (e.g. economic, traffic, environmental, quality-of-life, community character), in order to be a "Plan".

- Planning Commission wisely changed the Mineral Station Study name from "Plan" to "Framework".

- Likewise, this document does not provide the necessary components of a "Plan", so it would be appropriate and correct to change this document name too.

2. Remove the addition of a housing use from the Columbine Square property, or make continued community business use much stronger.

- The public input was strongly negative regarding changing the use of the Columbine Square parcel from Community Business, to Residential.

- Somehow it appears that this process allowed the owner's desires to be incorporated while the public input was wiped out on this matter. Partly because the owner is an out-of-state billion-dollar real estate investment company, changing the use for their benefit alone is not appropriate.

<http://kairos-us.com/portfolio/>

<http://kairos-us.com/team/>

<http://kairos-us.com/who-we-are/>

- The investor owners have known throughout their possession that the Columbine Square property is zoned primarily for Community Business. If the market doesn't fit that right now, then they wait for the market to change. Markets do change, and well-run real estate businesses are professionally managed to handle market cycles. Markets are explicitly NOT a reason for Cities to change their long-range land uses. This document should NOT claim that housing is an appropriate use for this site.

- This is a commercial corner and should be protected as commercial for Littleton's long term good. The City's Market and Void Analysis confirms this. Cities stand to lose when they change long-range land uses for transient market conditions.

- This Land Use change is a major change with impacts, seemingly mostly negative, on traffic patterns; City and County and District income and expenses; and quality of life for residents and visitors; none of which have been interactively discussed and agreed to.

3. The economic basis for this document is a major weakness and must be strengthened.

- The economic report in this Plan (Appendix B) is interesting, but it appears to be the driver for much of what the Plan describes - although it is not integrated with citizen input, and not sanity-checked or verified. It's just one opinion based on

one source's tools and very limited time and analysis.

- The consultant's economic report should at least be reconciled with the **Market and Retail Void Analyses** done by our City Economic Development Staff in July 2017.

- It's completely irregular, inappropriate and irresponsible to proceed with this Corridor concept, without understanding and resolving the issues between at least the two different economic reports (the consultant's and the City's). And the citizens and decision-makers should receive a staff report on the two economic reports, and get a chance to give feedback and input on the economic ideas, so we'd have a more **integrated, balanced economic basis** for the document.

- This version is inherently weak because the economic basis is one-sided, isolated, very limited, untested and unquestioned. Using this single-source unintegrated report as a basis for major changes is bad practice, and numerous changes in this document based on this single source are potentially destructive to the city.

4. There is no or inadequate protection for the South Platte River in this document.

- As a resident near the river, I can unfortunately report major declines in animals including birds that depend on the River over the past 6 years or so.

- This document describes changes to the River-adjacent land uses, mostly more intense and crowded.

- This document must, on the public's and the City's behalf, identify goals for River character and environment, and then define land uses and actions that protect that River character.

- This document doesn't include agreed-upon goals or protections for the River, and it must in order to be a Plan.

5. Similarly, there is no provision for designing redevelopment based on traffic performance requirements.

- traffic improvement and safety was one of two major inputs from the public.

- note the irony (or worse) of the Public Works Department presenting a Bowles/Federal Intersection Open House this Friday, while the Planning department is presenting a document with no measurable traffic criteria.

- this document doesn't provide any traffic integration with the described changes in land use. It needs to provide a traffic design and analysis along with the changes.

Planning Commission, this evening, please vote to Table this proposed "Belleview Corridor Plan" to a Date Certain, so that the above items may be addressed.

Thanks for your consideration.

Pam Chadbourne  
downtown resident and homeowner, Council District 1

--

**The Belleview Corridor Draft:**  
*Is it Really a Corridor Plan or a Plan for Development?*  
*Observations for the 6/11/18 Planning Commission Meeting*

It's been observed that all of us struggle to understand things we are unprepared, or actually unable to hear. The subject draft before Commission this evening illustrates that principle. Its content reveals that the city and its trusted contractor have been able to hear only some public concerns being expressed by affected publics.

This body is named a planning commission. Yet this work is staffed by our municipal Community Development Department, and some commissioners are actually developers themselves. Probably then, none of us should be surprised if the draft plan and the accompanying dialogue of staff, consultants and even some Commission members often appears to resemble that of a development commission instead.

Needed: Community/Resource Stewardship to Balance the draft's Redevelopment Focus  
To illustrate:

- **Chapter 3, Vision and Principles:** Several citizen concerns regarding corridor character and end-results or outcomes have been voiced. But four of the five corridor principles instead appear to be focused on change: 1-Create identity, 2-Improve mobility & safety, 4-Support businesses, and 5-Create gathering places. Principle 3-splits Neighborhood concerns for protection with reinvestment.
- **Principles (cont.)—Definition of Desired Character Conditions and End-Results Missing:** Although Clarion has observed citizens' sense-of-place concerns, draft content under principle three's two goals, "protect...character" and "nurture...community," fail to prescribe objectively defined future character conditions. Neither does the draft identify any objective outcomes to affected places as plan objectives to ensure that communities will indeed be nurtured.
- **Principles (cont.)—Distinct Identity:** Reflecting the firm's relative unfamiliarity with objectively defined community character, Clarion's planner observed before the Commission: "the identity piece is the hardest piece of this."
- **Principles (cont.)—Future Design Guidelines:** Yet Clarion recognized the need for future design guidelines, explaining that this recognizes that this is one way that the character of intact neighborhoods could be protected. Yet Commissioner Rudnicki said, "Principle 3, NR5 and NR6 concern me as an architect . . . it's in here and it makes be nervous."
- **Chapter 5 Corridor Enhancements:** Repeated use of "Enhancements" and "Improvement" verbiage indicates this chapter is more about development than corridor/community neighborhood character stewardship. This is not simply a matter of semantics challenge but it reflects imbalanced plan content.

- **Enhancements (cont.)**—Clarion’s draft views the river’s edge as space to be “activated” rather than protected and maintained (cf. citizen concerns and the city’s historic pledge for steward and maintenance of the defining character of these regionally significant natural resources). Indeed, Clarion said it worked closely with Public Works to mesh the plan with projects already has underway or planned.
- **Chapter 6, Implementation:** Clarion also explained there is a whole section of this chapter addressing community character. Yet character per se is never mentioned and the narrative for Principle 3 instead addresses meetings, outreach (3x), evaluations, and processes for infill and redevelopment standards. Neither resource nor community character stewardship are objectively addressed.
- **Appendix A, Existing Conditions—Character and Identity:** This misrepresents kinds of structures (i.e., Single-family, Multi-family, and Mixed-use) as character—adding in elements of urban design, materials, land/streetscapes, and signage. These are important project planning elements but do not help define the character of the land and its various uses. Character defines the relative proportions of green biomass volume, three-dimensional space occupied by buildings, and two-dimensional hardscape devoted to roadways and parking—plus elements of design associated with each.

#### A More Well-Integrated Conceptual Framework is Needful

At least four different levels of planning have been identified. It should not be surprising that the expressed concerns of various publics span all four dimensions. This may not be as well articulated or prominent for Belleview than in other areas of the city, but nevertheless their concerns are certainly here for all ears attuned to hear them.

As the preceding observations indicate, the Belleview corridor draft seems to be shortstopped at level 2 below:

4. **Strategic** Planning—optimizing positive & minimizing adverse outcomes
3. **Land Use/Character** Planning—community and resource character
- 
2. **Project/Action** Planning
1. **Site** Planning and Design

Not all planners view planning in the same way.

- a) Developers have been observed characteristically wanting plans to directly facilitate construction and related “improvement” actions and are therefore typically anchored to project planning (level 3 above).

- b) By contrast, citizens and other affected publics valuing definite character conditions are concerned about the erosive effect of continued urbanized development on community character (level 2 above).
- c) Homeowners and other affected publics who live nearby have even greater concerns. They're concerned about how well developments fit immediate neighborhoods (level 1 above) *and* about consequences: positive and negative long-term effects that development plans such as this have on neighborhood quality of life, the natural environment, social and economic outcomes, and human well-being.

Because Community Development's mission is just that, development, none of us should probably not find surprising that its efforts and those of its contractors and the builders they serve appear consumed by project development and redevelopment—and therefore remain shortstopped at planning level two above. But to pass the straight-faced test as a bona fide corridor plan, the draft yet needs to supply the missing content citizens have called for.

To summarize, noticeably missing is objective definition of planned, desired future community character conditions *and* identification of the end-results desired by citizens and avoidance of undesirable adverse impacts. These could be readily added to the draft respectively as desired future conditions and plan objectives.

In view of the city's ongoing effort to develop an updated citywide comprehensive plan that identifies and respects citizen desires, need for the Planning Commission to insist on supplying the missing content seems doubly important.

Thank you very much!

Don Bruns  
District IV