

Neighborhood Outreach
May 9, 2022

Agenda

1. Overview of the project.

- a. The Arcadia Creek neighborhood is in Littleton, Colorado, where W. Leawood Drive, S. Sheridan Blvd., and W. Christensen Lane meet in unincorporated Jefferson and Arapahoe Counties.
- b. The property is 9.46 acres with 7.47 acres +/- in Jefferson County, with the remainder in Arapahoe County.
- c. The Arcadia Creek neighborhood will consist of twenty-three (23) detached single-family homes in Jefferson County, and two (2) detached single-family homes in Arapahoe County, which adds one additional home in Arapahoe County than exists today.
 - i. We are currently working with KGA, our architectural firm, on our exterior elevations for the homes with a desire to have more of a country farmhouse feel.
- d. Arcadia Creek's Plat is in line with our Official Development Plan, approved by the Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners in August 2020, and our current zoning in Arapahoe County.
- e. The Arcadia Creek community is designed as a gated covenant restricted, 55+, 100% maintenance-free, active adult community.
 - i. The ability to do this type of community was established under HUD, in 1995, under President Clinton in the HOPA act, Housing for Older Persons Act.
- f. Arapahoe County District Court resolved access from the neighborhood along Christensen Lane in July of 2020.

- i. The ruling determined that we have unlimited, unrestricted, permanent rights of ingress and egress from the neighborhood to the Lane.
- g. The Arapahoe County Technical Review Committee approved our variance design dealing with Christensen Lane's construction, which is subject to the BOCC approval in our final plat.
 - i. That design includes +/-, 8' drive lanes, 2' shoulders, Drainage enhancements, and a 5' pedestrian lane separated by Bollards from the drive lane.
 - 1. This stretch of the Lane is designed for safety.
 - a. Smaller drive lanes slow traffic
 - b. Bollards allow the flow of pedestrian and bike traffic to move safely in and out of the pedestrian lane away from cars.
 - ii. South Metro Fire and Rescue has approved the designs of both our driveway and Christensen Lane.
 - iii. Arcadia will be improving the emergency access gate at Christensen and Leawood.
- h. The neighborhood will result in 108 new car trips per day to and from the neighborhood. Our traffic engineers determined this calculation at Kimley Horn. The anticipated traffic flow represented by the report shows 70% of the traffic moving along Christensenland the remaining 30% along Leawood.
- i. We are working with Southeast Metro Stom Water Authority, SEMSWA, on the redesign of the Culvert Crossing on our private Drive.
 - i. The replacement of the culvert will result in significant improvements, limiting overtopping during storm events.
- j. The barn will be renovated for use by the neighborhood.

- k. We are working with the Leawood Park and Recreation District on the extension of the trail system, which will allow public access through the neighborhood and provide connectivity to the Jeffco trail system running along Dutch Creek by their bridge on Weaver Ave.

2. The Platting Process is similar in both counties, with some minor differences.

- a. Our application is for a Minor Subdivision, which is used to finalize land ownership and related interests within the proposed subdivision boundaries. Minor Subdivisions are processed as final plats with hearings in front of the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. The review process for this application as a Minor Subdivision will include the following steps.
- b. A pre-submittal meeting with County staff to discuss the proposed development begins the process, and has been completed.
- c. Conduct a neighborhood meeting before submitting a formal application to the County, which is what we are doing tonight
- d. Submission of the application.
 - i. When applying for a plat, a complete set of engineered plans the plan set, along with other required documentation, is submitted to the County.
 - 1. The engineered plan set provides the County with all the detail on how the neighborhood will be constructed. The plan set includes but is not limited to:
 - a. Water and Sewer layouts.
 - b. Road design
 - c. Grading
 - d. Drainage
 - e. Detention
 - f. Lighting
- e. Staff and referral agencies review and comment on the documents that have been submitted in the application. Once reviewed, the staff refers the documents back to the applicant for revisions based on comments.

- f. Applicant amends the application to address comments received from staff and referring agencies.
- g. The process of review and comment between the applicant and staff can be several rounds. Typically, 2-3 revisions.
- h. Once complete, the application goes to the Planning Commission for a public hearing, which then makes a recommendation regarding the application to the Board of County Commissioners.
- i. The Board of County Commissioners then holds a public hearing, which finalizes the application.
- j. The applicant provides final documents to the staff for last review and comment if approved.
- k. Final documents are recorded and become public records.

3. Neighborhood Q & A

Site Plan



ARCADIA CREEK
CONCEPT PLAN
DATE 09/04/19



Community Comments
Neighborhood Outreach May 9, 2022
Arcadia Creek

Thirty-three individuals signed the sign-in sheets; by our hard count, we had 41 individuals at the meeting.

Here is the summary of the public comments, the Developer's response at the meeting, and detailed comments to those questions and comments by the developer.

1. Jeff Stronger- 4872 Christensen Drive, Fox Hollow
 - a. Comments, he questioned the validity of the traffic study, was concerned about safety regarding Christensen Lane, accused me of having "blood on my hands," and said that the only reason I was doing the project was to "add to my legacy."
 - b. The developer response at the meeting dealt with the traffic study, our Lane design, and how we focused on safety.
 - c. Developer Response,
 - i. Our traffic study has been updated and is included in our application package. The study was by our traffic engineer, Curtis Rowe, who is associated with Kimely Horn. His analysis and the trip generations reflected in his research are compiled using the nationwide methodology to assess traffic impact by development.
 - ii. As to his concerns about the safety of the Lane, our Lane improvements utilize delineated 8' drive lanes to slow traffic. There is a designated pedestrian walkway separated from the drive lanes by bollards, and bikes can maneuver safely into the pedestrian lane to avoid traffic. No parking signs are posted on the Lane. When completed, our section of the Lane will be the safest section of Christensen Lane. The technical review committee approved our design in March 2020.
 - iii. I will not respond to his comments about having "blood on my hands" or "adding to my legacy."

As approved by the TRC, our Lane design addresses the safety issue related to the Lane. The Developer has answered his comments regarding the trip generation. His personal statements about the Developer do not merit a response.

2. Jeff Veres- 5309 W. Hoover Drive, Vintage Reserve

- a. Comments, His questions were about traffic safety along Christensen Lane and the historical value of the Barn.
- b. The developer's response at the meeting repeated the information regarding our traffic study, our Lane design, and how we have focused on safety.
- c. Developer Response,
 - i. See section 1.c.ii above.
 - ii. The following is the answer to his question about the historical value of the Barn. We are not sure of the exact age of the Barn, but to the best of our knowledge, the Barn was in existence when the property was transferred to Victor Christensen from Ed Bowles in 1912. The Barn has been renovated over the years and is currently used as a single-family rental. Jefferson County recognized our efforts to incorporate the Barn into our neighborhood plan during the zoning process. We will be doing a complete renovation to the Barn so the neighborhood's residents can use it. The neighborhood association will control the Barn's use, which is defined in the association's governing documents. Another question during the meeting was the accusation that I was renovating the Barn to use as a commercial event center. We will not have an interest in the Barn after the neighborhood is turned over to the association, and the controlling documents do not allow for commercial uses. I told them that this was not the case, that the neighborhood, not the Developer, would control the Barn.

Based on these comments, there are no changes to incorporate into the Developer's plan.

3. Bob Wilbanks – 4944 Christensen Drive, Fox Hollow

- a. Comments, he asked about the density of the project and fire spread.
- b. The developer's response at the meeting dealt with density and how the change from an R-1 to a PD zoning, combined with the specifics of our ODP, Official Development Plan, sustainably limited the project's density by eliminating the ability for accessory use buildings on individual lots.

c. Developer response,

- i. Density was very prevalent in our zoning hearings. Our efforts to change the zoning in Jefferson County from R-1 to a PD, combined with the R-2 zoning in Arapahoe County, resulted in a density of 2.6 building units per acre, with 37% of our project remaining in open space. Our efforts eliminated accessory uses like a small rental unit, housing for in-laws, a home office, and many more options from ever being built in this location. Had accessory uses remained in place, it would have resulted in significantly higher density and traffic generation from the neighborhood, which our neighbors claim they don't want. Ultimately, our neighborhood as an age-restricted community provides a much-needed housing product, not easily found in the County, and limits density and traffic.
- ii. Traffic, like density, was prevalent in our zoning hearings. Had the R-1 zoning, with accessory use capacity, remained in place, and had the neighborhood been built under those zoning conditions, the traffic would have increased a minimum of 2X's above the projected 108 vehicle trips our community will generate per day. This assumes that the community under R-1 zoning would have 20 single-family homes without any consideration for accessory buildings.
- iii. The need for this type of housing that allows people to age in place is a product desperately needed in this region of the Metro area. Our project fits the surrounding neighborhood economically and will have minimal impact on the surrounding area.
- iv. One significant mitigation factor regarding the spread of fire within our community is that we have no internal fencing between homes, as defined in our ODP in Jefferson County. Although we designed this for maintenance purposes, it turns out this enhances fire mitigation within a community now that we know privacy fencing significantly contributes to the spread of wildfire. In addition, our neighborhood will now ensure that our neighbor at 5090 W. Christensen Lane will always have access to emergency services outside the flood plain which they do not have now.

Because these questions are informational, there are no changes to the project the Developer should consider.

4. Karlen Tucker- 4520 Christensen Lane, resident on Christensen Lane.

- a. Comments, what is the configuration of sidewalks on Christensen Lane, what is the price range of the homes you will be building, and do we currently have legal access to the Lane or only after going through the county process?
- b. The developer's response at the meeting discussed the Christensen Lane design approved by the TRC and how our access to the Lane was equal to those who have access to the Lane, as confirmed by the Arapahoe County District Court.
- c. Developer response,
 - i. No typical sidewalks are associated with the Lane but rather a designated paved pedestrian lane, like other portions of the Lane; however, in our case, the pedestrian walkway is separated from drive lanes by bollards. The final design and configuration of the Lane are still being engineered. Once completed, the pedestrian walkway will tie into the existing pedestrian walkway beginning at the Fox Hollow entrance.
 - ii. The base price of our homes will be more than \$1.5M, and final prices will vary based on the customization of each homeowner.
 - iii. In July 2020, the District Court of Arapahoe County reaffirmed our legal access to the Lane as permanent "unrestricted and unlimited" rights of ingress and egress over the Lane.

Because these questions are informational, there are no changes to the project the Developer should consider.

5. Carissa Koran- 4600 W. Christensen Lane, resident on Christensen Lane.

- a. Comments, what is the access through the emergency gate at the end of Christensen Lane?
- b. The developer's response at the meeting required more information from the neighbor asking the question. After receiving more information, we revisited the agenda item, discussing the design and use of the emergency access point.
- c. Developer response,
 - i. In asking additional questions, I determined that she was concerned about east/west traffic coming down the Lane through the emergency access point. Only emergency services will have access to the Lane from this point. I also reaffirmed that the neighborhood is designed with two gates to eliminate cut-through traffic flow from Leawood to Christensen Lane and vice versa.

The Developer has remedied this problem in our design, and no further consideration on this issue needs to be considered.

6. Anne Larson- 5090 W. Christensen Lane, Fox Hollow

- a. Comment, she was concerned that our survey did not match hers.
- b. The developer responded at the meeting by explaining what we had asked our surveyor to do concerning their property.
- c. Developer response,
 - i. I explained that when we surveyed the property, we asked our surveyor to place two pins on our property, not the property line, where the Larson's driveway enters our private drive. We did this to better understand their mailbox and driveway entrance in relation to our property and the property line. Therefore, the stakes were labeled approximate; they were not on the actual property line and were placed at our request.

The Developer needs no further consideration on this issue.

7. Bob Scheibel- 6395 S. Xavier Court, Coventry

- a. Comment, what are the construction traffic plans for Christensen Lane?
- b. The developer's response at the meeting focused on having construction traffic use our west entrance through Leawood.
- c. Developer response,
 - i. We will be required to enter a construction traffic plan with each County, but our intention is not to use Christensen Lane for construction traffic.
 - 1. Another member of the community accused me of dodging the question. I pointed out that we had executed an agreement with Christensen Lane Estates with language about construction traffic. Still, I didn't recall all the nuances of the language dealing with construction traffic, and I didn't have the document with me.
 - ii. Since the meeting, I have reviewed the CLE agreement, and my answer was correct; our intent is not to use the Lane for construction traffic, and

we will use our best efforts in that regard. We further agreed to incorporate language into our construction agreements to prohibit traffic on the Lane. The agreement also dealt with Arcadia's pro-rata share maintenance on the front third of the Lane, gating for our project to limit east/west traffic on the Lane, liability of damage to the Lane during construction, and other items, and that this was a recorded document.

The Developer has taken the necessary steps to limit construction traffic on the Lane by entering into a binding agreement with Christensen Lane Estates. The Developer has secured the cooperation of CLE and Columbine Community Church to post a sign instructing construction traffic not to use the Lane. The Developer has taken the necessary steps to curtail potential construction traffic down the Lane. No further action is needed besides executing a construction traffic agreement with the County upon approval.

8. Lori Bechter- 4993 Christensen Drive, Fox Hollow

- a. Comment, questioning the traffic count of 108 trip generations per day and if vendor traffic is calculated in the count.
- b. The developer's response at the meeting covered the traffic issue again.
- c. Developer response
 - i. Trip generation is determined by the methodology used nationwide for development and takes into account all traffic, including vendors.

Because these questions are informational, there are no changes to the project the Developer should consider.

9. Steve Koets- 4580 Christensen Lane, resident on Christensen Lane.

- a. Comments, concerned about the maintenance of the Lane and right to improve the Lane, and questioned under what authority?
- b. The developer's response at the meeting detailed our rights to improve and maintain the western 1200 feet of Christensen Lane. The maintenance would be done through an association, just as the front two-thirds of the Lane is being maintained today, and an agreement between us and CLE to pay our pro-rata share of maintenance for the front third of the Lane had been executed. I told them that no agreement was in place for the care of the middle section of the Lane because Fox Hollow has refused to work on a settlement on multiple occasions. We discussed that my authority to do this work is the same as his, which the courts reaffirmed. As a part of our development, we are taking the

responsibility of improving and maintaining a large portion of the Lane that has not been adequately cared for since the settlement agreements that provide access to the Lane was established.

- c. Developer response,
 - i. Jeff Good and Andy Larsen have maintained the lane west of the Fox Hollow entrance over the past 22 years. The western Lane section was in rough condition when Good acquired our property from the Weiders. Jeff maintained and significantly improved that section of the Lane once he became our property owner in 2000, and since 2017 Andy Larsen has continued that effort.
 - ii. We have, from day one, stipulated that it is our right to construct and then our obligation to maintain the last 1200 feet of Christensen Lane west of the entrance of Fox Hollow as an off-site improvement tied to our development. The court affirmed our authority for unlimited, unrestricted, permanent access rights to the Lane. To meet the approval criteria of TRC, we must improve the Lane and then have a permanent maintenance policy in place for this section of the Lane.
 - iii. In addition, we have also said that we should pay our pro-rata share of the section of the Lane defined in the settlement agreement that gave the Fox Hollow Neighborhood access to the Lane. The maintenance of the Lane from Christensen Lane Estates to the entrance of Fox Hollow is clearly defined within that agreement.
 - iv. That settlement agreement also stated that if the Fox Hollow developer extended the paving west of their entrance, they were required to put in a speed bump. Fox Hollow's Developer never extended the Lane paving past their entry. Fox Hollow has never pursued any effort to improve or maintain any portion of the Lane past their entrance. Only Good and Larsen have done any maintenance to the Lane in the last 22 years.
 - v. During our Quiet Title action, we tried on multiple occasions to enter into a maintenance agreement with Fox Hollow like the one we executed with Christensen Lane Estates and have been rebuffed each time.
 - vi. We have stipulated that we should pay our pro-rata share of the maintenance of the front third of the Lane maintained by Christensen Lane Estates and entered into an agreement that defines our obligation for that portion of the Lane.

- vii. We all have the same permanent “unrestricted and unlimited” rights of ingress and egress over the Lane as all associated with the settlement agreements have. The court gives us the authority of unrestricted use; the County defines the improvement design for the Lane; in this case, the variance that the TRC approved. We have not and would not ask anyone living on the Lane who also has permanent “unrestricted and unlimited” rights of ingress and egress over the Lane to assume any financial obligation for the improvements or maintenance of this section of the Lane, our development, our cost.

The Developer requests an ongoing maintenance agreement for the Lane after construction. That the agreement is defined in the SIA between the County and the Developer, and this section of the Lane be defined within its own tract.

10. Jack Reutzell- 4903 Christensen Drive, Fox Hollow

- a. Comment, what happens to the project if Arapahoe County doesn't approve it?
- b. The developer's response at the meeting was that we expect to be approved.

No further developer action is required.

11. Susan Scheibel- 6395 S. Xavier Court, Coventry

- a. Comment, how can we get contact information for your team?
- b. Developer response, we will get you the information. Our team members met with her and her husband after the meeting and gave them contact information.

No further developer action is required.

12. Kim Manning- 5026 Christensen Drive, Fox Hollow.

- a. Comments, she was concerned about tree removal on the right side of the Fox Hollow monument. She questioned the width of Christensen Lane. She was worried about the rights of the owner of the 4-car garage on Christensen Lane and their ability to park cars on the Lane. She asked why we were keeping the Barn and said we plan to use it for weddings and events. She wanted to know why I think the Barn is an improvement to the area. She asked if 55+ communities are even legal. She accused me of telling half-truths and misleading everyone.
- b. The developer's response at the meeting stipulated that we do everything we can to retain trees, and if a tree is on Fox Hollow Property outside the boundary

of the Lane, we will not touch it. The width of the Lane varies from Platte Canyon to Leawood, and we are designing the Lane based on the specifications. I reiterated the earlier discussion on the Barn and finished the conversation explaining HOPA, the Housing for Older Persons Act that makes 55+ communities legal.

- c. Developer response,
 - i. Our efforts are to retain trees, not remove them; I'm not aware of any trees on the property outside the surveyed Lane that would be in jeopardy of removal. If trees are on HOA property outside the boundary of the Lane, then we would not be removing them. We are working to preserve the ambiance of the Lane through our design.
 - ii. The width of the Lane varies from Platte Canyon to the intersection of Leawood. Our design for Christensen is to adhere to the concept presented to the Technical Review Committee, the TRC.
 - iii. Regarding the owner of the 4-car garage, the improvements to the Lane will make the transition into their garage easier, but they will not be able to park on the Lane. Not aware of anyone who has the right to park on the Lane today.
 - iv. I reiterated that the association would control the Barn, determine how the facility is used and that it would not be used as a commercial venture. I further explained that the significance of retaining the Barn allows the property's heritage to be acknowledged and that we were commended during our rezoning for keeping the Barn.
 - v. I reiterated the information I presented regarding the HOPA Act and how 55+ communities fall under HUD.
 - vi. I found no need to respond to personal accusations.

Because these questions are informational, there are no changes to the project the Developer should consider.

13. Reggie Bland- 6336 S. Benton Way, Leawood

- a. He wants to know where the utilities are coming from because he has a large electrical transformer in his yard.
- b. Developer comments,

- i. We will follow up once we have an answer. Our engineer spoke with Reggie after the meeting and will contact him with the information once we have it.

Because the question is seeking information, the Developer will follow up with the owner directly.

14. Nathan Koran - 4600 W. Christensen Lane, resident on Christensen Lane.

- a. Comments: What are the home's square footage, and how many bedrooms and baths?
- b. Developer comments,
 - i. I explained that our homes ranged between 2250 and 3080 square feet on the main level and that they all had full basements of equal size. I discussed that footprints for the homes were set but that everything in the home's interior is customizable. Our homes all were main floor master suites, and the number of bedrooms and baths would vary based on the client and changes or options they would select.

Because these questions are informational, there are no changes to the project the Developer should consider.

15. Bill Davis- 5425 W. Euclid Ave, Vintage Reserve.

- a. Comments, are we using a Metro District or HOA?
- b. The developer's response at the meeting was that an HOA would govern the neighborhood.
- c. Developer Comments,
 - i. We are not using a Metro District, and the neighborhood will have a significant HOA. The HOA is responsible for all neighborhood maintenance, including the home's exterior, the enforcement of the 55+ restrictions, and the ongoing maintenance of the private roads and Christensen Lane.

Because these questions are informational, there are no changes to the project the Developer should consider.

16. John Overmyer- 4256 Christensen Lane, resident on Christensen Lane.

- a. Comments, will Christensen Lane remain private, did they count the traffic, and what happens to the large cottonwood trees?
- b. The developer responded again at the meeting that the Lane would remain private, with the maintenance for the western 1200 feet of the Lane being the responsibility of our HOA. I explained again that the traffic study is based on national standards associated with land development, and no physical counts were done for there is no traffic from the community to be counted before the development is completed. I explained that we were designing the Lane in such a way to retain the large trees.
- c. Developer Comments,
 - i. Nothing we do to the Lane would change it from remaining a private lane. We will stop the current east/west cut-through traffic across our property by gating our neighborhood.
 - ii. Our engineers are designing the Lane, drainage, and pedestrian walkway in a manner to preserve the large cottonwood on the north side of the Lane to retain its aesthetic appeal of the Lane.

Because these questions are informational, there are no changes to the project the Developer should consider. The Developer will continue to design Christensen Lane to retain the giant cottonwood tree on the north side.

17. Gary Beutler- 4802 Christensen Dr, Fox Hollow

- a. Comments, he indicated that he was in the business and asked if we had surveyed the legal description of the Lane. He appreciated our willingness to maintain our portion of the Lane, but that the damage our neighborhood would do to the portion of the Lane that Fox Hollows is responsible for maintaining exceeded what they had agreed to.
- b. The developer's response at the meeting was to have our engineer explain that we had surveyed the Lane and that our survey showed all plottable and non-plottable items associated with the Lane. He continued to challenge us on this issue, and we explained that non-plottable items are found on page one of the Alta-Survey, with plottable items on page two. Once we explained this to him, it brought the back and forth to a conclusion with no additional follow-up questions.
- c. Developers Comments,

- i. Our survey defines all plottable and non-plottable items associated with the Lane.
- ii. No agreement called for the Developer of Fox Hollow to maintain or improve the 1200 feet of the Lane past the Fox Hollow entrance. The settlement agreement specifies that if they elected to pave the section west of the Fox Hollow entrance, a speed bump similar to that found in the section of the Lane between Fox Hollow and CLE would be required. During the last 25 years, there has been no attempt by Fox Hollow to maintain any portion of the Lane west of their entrance. Since 2000, all maintenance of Lane west of the Fox Hollow entrance has been done by our previous owner and the owner of 5090 W. Christensen Lane beginning in 2017 when they moved in.
- iii. Our association will be responsible for the improvement and perpetual maintenance of the Lane west of the Fox Hollow entrance to the end of Christensen Lane. We have repeatedly tried to reach an agreement with Fox Hollow to pay our pro-rata share of the maintenance costs for the section of the Lane between Christensen Lane Estates and the entrance of Fox Hollow as defined in the settlement agreement. Fox Hollow is responsible for maintaining this section of the Lane, but each of our attempts at settling has been rebuffed by Fox Hollow. The agreement to pay our pro-rata share of maintenance on the middle section of the Lane would be similar to the one we executed with Christensen Lane Estates and would define the pro-rata share of maintenance we would be required to pay.

The Developer continues to be willing to settle with Fox Hollow regarding paying our pro-rata share for maintenance of the section of the Lane they are responsible for maintaining.

18. D J Steines – 6391 S. Zenobia Ct., Coventry

- a. Comments, he wanted to know how traffic goes down when you go from 2 homes in the neighborhood to 25 homes and stated that the traffic is not the 108 car trips that I say but is the 250 car trips our report shows.
- b. The developer's response during the meeting explained that during the zoning process with Jefferson County, their Planning Staff required our traffic engineer to show trip generation for both an R-1 single-family and a 55+ age-restricted community under the proposed PD zoning. The traffic counts for the R-1 community reflected 236 daily trips as opposed to the 108 daily trips our 55+ community will generate.

- c. Developer comments,
 - i. Once our zoning was approved, we knew that our development would generate 108 daily vehicle trips. The calculations in our traffic study are based on the entire neighborhood of 25 homes, not the number of homes in individual counties. Trip Generation¹, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), is the acknowledged source for trip generation rates. ITE has established trip rates in nationwide studies of similar land uses. Trip generation is based on the ITE Trip Generation, 11th Edition (most current edition) average rate equations for Senior Adult Housing – Single-Family (ITE Code 251).

Because these questions are informational, there are no changes to the project the Developer should consider.

19. Betsy Major – 5805 W. Leawood Drive, Leawood

- a. Comments, how will the construction traffic reach the property?
- b. The developer responded at the meeting by revisiting the construction traffic issue covered earlier in the meeting.
- c. Developer Comments,
 - i. We spoke at length regarding construction traffic, so please refer to my earlier comments regarding construction traffic found in section 7.c of this document.

Because these questions are informational, there are no changes to the project the Developer should consider.

20. John Brittan- 4852 Christensen Drive, Fox Hollow

- a. Comments, what is the Arapahoe County Zoning, and what guarantee do we have that the neighborhood gates will remain in place once you are gone?
- b. The developer's response at the meeting indicated that the zoning in Arapahoe county is R-2 and that the association's governing documents stipulate that the community remains a gated community.
- c. Developer Comments,

- i. We have always maintained that R-2 zoning in Arapahoe County was sufficient and that there was no need for a zoning change.
- ii. Being a gated community is defined within our governing documents, including the maintenance associated with the gates. To ensure the community remains gated, I would suggest incorporating the issue of the gates into our SIA or another document with the County.

The Developer would agree to incorporate the neighbor gates into the SIA or another county-drafted document to memorialize the neighborhood gates.

21. Sue Jack- 6188 Coventry Lane, Coventry

- a. Comment, what is the cost difference between extending Sheridan south to Coal Mine?
- b. The developer's response at the meeting was to point out that this request came up many times during our zoning process. As we have always maintained, we have never seriously considered that option since we have two points of entry to our community, the one on Christensen and the one on Leawood. This is unlike the other neighborhoods along Christensen Lane, which have only an additional emergency service access point.
- c. Developer Comments,
 - i. We have never seriously looked at this option for several reasons. First, we have two legal access points to our neighborhood, Leawood Drive and Christensen Lane. Second, it would require us to build and cross wetlands in both counties, and both counties state in their comprehensive plans that if you don't need to build in wetlands, then stay out; we already have two points of access no need to pursue another. Third, it would have required us to acquire land we don't own for a problem we don't have, which is two points of access.

This solution is not viable and unnecessary since the Developer already has two viable points of access to their project. The Developer will not consider this solution.

All the questions and comments posed by the meeting participants were no different from those addressed to the Developer during the last several years and during the project's zoning hearings. The Developer's responses align with the answers they've been communicating to the neighborhoods about the project for the last several years.

22. On July 18, 2022, I met with Dave Tabor for coffee at his request to discuss his ideas concerning the project. Mr. Tabor lives at 6387 S. Wolff Ct. in the Coventry neighborhood, and his home backs to the Lane. He provided me with a document that outlined five specific points for discussion. I have attached that document as additional community interaction.

a. The Developer's comments on each of those points are.

i. Regarding his first request that the Lane be constructed to be "pedestrian friendly," I explained to him that we have already met this goal. I discussed how narrowing the drive lanes will slow traffic and that this technic is used throughout the country as an effective method of dealing with traffic calming. We discuss how we have incorporated bollards as opposed to a fence into the design separating the pedestrian walkway from the drive lanes and that this design will provide a more open feel while continuing to provide a safe zone for pedestrians and bicyclists. I indicated that we would not pursue a single wide lane since our design was acceptable to the TRC and SMDFR and conformed to the existing sections of the Lane.

1. We believe that we have already achieved his recommendation except for one single wide Lane of traffic through our design that the TRC approved, and we will not take further action on this issue.

ii. The second request was to ban all commercial traffic down the Lane. His goal in this request is to stop commercial traffic from going past his property, which he agreed was the purpose of the request. I explained to him that this would not be feasible and that we would not spend any time in consideration of this request. However, based on our settlement agreement with CLE, I did point out that we would be taking significant steps to deter construction traffic from using the Lane, including signage on the Lane and penalties for use by our contractors for violating their construction agreements. In addition, I did indicate that since our community provides 100% of the maintenance for the community, we will be able to control some of the commercial traffic. For example, I pointed out that there would be only one provider to do the project's landscape maintenance and that the association can dictate that they use our west entrance to reach the property.

1. We will continue to enforce that construction traffic does not use the Lane but will take no steps to limit commercial traffic such as UPS, FedEx, Amazon, the US postal service, or any other type of commercial vehicle from using the Lane in the future. We will also

instruct our commercial vendors doing work for the community that the association has contracted with to use our west entrance.

- iii. The third request was regarding our gates and concern that they would "degrade" over time, allowing for cut-through traffic. I pointed out that the gate systems of today are significantly different from those in the past. Through technology, a homeowner can now control access through the gate using their smartphone. I also discuss that all our homes will have a control 4 system allowing full automation to the house and techniques to allow control of the gate.
 1. The Developer's gate system will utilize technology to maximize the security aspect of the gate system.

- iv. The fourth request asked if I would be open to participating financially in improving the fence situation along the Lane. I told him that in our first meeting with the Fox Hollow HOA in December of 2016, we indicated that we were open to solutions along the Lane, including fence improvements. However, their response to that meeting was to tell me they would do everything they could to oppose our project. Since then, we have been forced to spend significant time and money affirming our rights to the Lane. Our appetite to make additional improvements to private property fences, where property owners have let their fences deteriorate, is not high on our list. I reminded him that he, along with the other vocal opponents to the project, had done everything they could to stop the project, and now that we are close to being approved, it's ironic that people are now wanting to see what we can do for them.
 1. We have no further comments on this request.

- v. The fifth request dealt with the placement of our gates and how to minimize the impact on nearby residents. I indicated that the Christensen Lane gate's location would be determined by the flood plain and our ability to redirect and turn traffic around.
 1. The placement of the gate and the turnaround are a part of our construction plans and will be subject to comments from the County during our review process.

Arcadia Creek - Q22-022

Neighborhood Outreach - Sign-In Sheet

May 9, 2022

NAME	ADDRESS	CITY/STATE/ZIP	PHONE	EMAIL
JEFF VERES	5309 W. HOOPER 5707 S. W. DR	LITTLETON, CO 80123	303 875 5402	jveres@gmail.com
JODY FONG	6381 S Zenobia Ct Littleton CO 80123	Littleton CO	415-439- 2567	jodygilbert22@yahoo.com
Wendy Fisher	4342 S. Zenobia Ct. Littleton CO 80123	Littleton CO	303-570- 1553	wendyfisher111@gmail.com
Jack Reutzel	4903 Christman Dr 1	Littleton, CO		jreutzel@fwbw.com
TIM CONNELL	6392 S. ZENOBIA CT LITTLETON CO	"	720 749 7366	tmconnell@gmail.com
Lauren Connell	"	"	"	"
Robert Susan Scheibel	Coventry			Scheibel303@comcast.net

Arcadia Creek - Q22-022
 Neighborhood Outreach - Sign-In Sheet
May 9, 2022

NAME	ADDRESS	CITY/STATE/ZIP	PHONE	EMAIL
Sheda Susbarro	6646 W. Peavotta	Ret Co 80123	3/794-7076	_____
Carissa Koran	4600 Christensen Lane	Littleton CO 80123	210 3094892	thekorans@gmail.com
Chic Koran	45 EAGLE DR	" "	970-390 1508	
Steve Ramp	6375 Schase St	L. Platte 80123	3-929-6243	stramp@comcast.net
SUE BROYLES	4 GLENRIDGE DR	LITTLETON 80123	3)3587538	psmjbro@aol.com
TIM PERRY	4417 Christensen Cir	Littleton 80123	3/5171268	
Gary Self	4561 Christensen Cir	"	3/907-8187	
Wm. Stratton	5723 W Hoover Ave	Littleton 80123	3/903-2285	

Arcadia Creek - Q22-022

Neighborhood Outreach - Sign-In Sheet

May 9, 2022

NAME	ADDRESS	CITY/STATE/ZIP	PHONE	EMAIL
Karlau & Angela Tucker	4520 Christensen Dr.	Littleton, CO 80123	720-746-8282	Karlau@ tuckeradvisors.com
Bob & Phong & Leisa	6395 S. JAYWAY	LITTLETON, CO 80123	7-911- 9539	
BRYAN KRESCHEF	6212 S. DELAWE CT	80123 LITTLETON, CO.	7-361- 6155	
Betsy - Mike Major	5805 W. Leewood Dr	Littleton	3- 503-3239	
BU DAVIS	5425 W. EUCLID LITTLETON	80123 LITTLETON	303 895-2197	WRD5425@ GMAIL.COM
Bernadine Greer	6398 So. WOLFF CT.	Littleton	303 794-8370	
DAVID TABOR	6387 S. WOLFF CT	Littleton	303-520 5525	DAVIDLTABOR@ HOTMAIL.COM
DI STEIN	6391 S. ZIMMERMAN ST	Littleton		
STEVE KOETS	4580 CHRISTENSEN LN.	LITTLETON	3-795 3187	SKOETS@COMCAST.NET
Russ BAUGHN	6081 W. WEAVER DR. LIT.	Littleton	3-526-7936	

Responses

- Country vendors
- ||| Traffic Study - Trip generation -
 - ||| Safety on C.L. (Tree var. design) →
 - ① Fox H. ext. trees
 - ② side walk
 - ③ trees
 - ④ catwalk.
 - ⑤ parking on C.L. 3
 - | # of Homes - B/Bath
of Homes -
 - Access to C.L. to remain private
 - | Emergency Access → E/W problem -
 - | Survey problems A.C. C.L. Survey - ?
 - C.C. Maintenance → Authority to improve
 - C.L. width -
 - | Parcel a commercial -
55+ legal
 - | Construction traffic -
C.L. → Leeward Elem -
 - Hoff / or Metro P. oversight
 - Contact Info.

Long Term Maintenance C. L.
settlement Fax H. like ~~etc~~ CLE.

Utilities

Armp. Zoning -

Leases -

Exit to Coal Mine

Dennig / Five