



CHERRY HILLS VILLAGE
COLORADO

2450 E. Quincy Avenue
Cherry Hills Village, CO 80113
www.cherryhillsvillage.com

City Hall
Telephone 303-789-2541
FAX 303-761-9386

Planning and Zoning Commission

Study Session Agenda

Tuesday, February 8, 2022

Following the conclusion of the February 8, 2022, Regular Meeting

This meeting will be held virtually with no in person participation.

To watch the live stream of the meeting or watch the recording later:

- 1) City website – [City Council Videos, Agendas, Packets, Minutes](#)
- 2) City YouTube channel – [City of Cherry Hills Village YouTube](#)

Meeting Information

The Planning and Zoning Commission will hold a study session on Tuesday, February 8, 2022, to discuss the Master Plan Update process.

Agenda

1. Call to Order
2. Discussion
 - a. Master Plan – Second Open House
3. Adjournment

MEMORANDUM

TO: CHAIR LUCAS AND MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

FROM: PAUL WORKMAN, PLANNING MANAGER

SUBJECT: STUDY SESSION – MASTER PLAN SECOND OPEN HOUSE

DATE: FEBRUARY 8, 2022

I. ISSUE:

Master Plan study session.

II. BACKGROUND:

The Planning and Zoning Commission (Commission) last discussed the Master Plan update at the January 11, 2022, meeting. At that meeting the Commission discussed the draft Vision Statement, draft Guiding Principles, and an approach to the next Open House. This will be a continuation of the discussion that was held that night. However, there will be an emphasis on the approach and materials for the next Open House.

III. DISCUSSION:

During the study session the Commission can expect to discuss the draft Vision Statement and the draft Guiding Principles as they have been updated since the Citizen’s Advisory Taskforce (CAT) meeting on January 20th. However, the format and content for the next Open House will be a focus.

IV. PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENT:

Not Applicable

V. RECOMMENDED MOTION:

Not applicable

VI. EXHIBIT(S):

Exhibit A – All comments received from any CAT member since their last meeting on January 20th.

Transportation

Under Transportation draft guidelines, the word “minimizes” strikes me as failing to capture the community objectives as recorded in past and present surveys. Additionally, how does one quantify this goal? Is it 3% less, 25% less or is it keeping the annual increase in cut-thru traffic to a minimum? Does this term imply we have a duty to support cut-thru traffic so we can only “minimize” it?

The classic response to increased traffic and congestion is to expand roadway capacity. This has the short-term effect of improving traffic flow and a long-term effect of increasing traffic volume. This is a path that implicitly says non-resident traffic can shape community character over time. The logic of this approach ultimately leads to four lanes on Quincy, Holly, Colorado and Franklin. But let’s face it, given a choice of widening roads and reducing traffic volumes, what would the community opt for between these two choices.

The alternative to the above path is to reduce congestion by reducing volume. This is the direction our community surveys point to as a clear preference. Facilitating higher volumes takes us in the opposite direction

I think the community sentiment is that our street system was developed to meet the needs of residents and property owners, to include institutional properties. The surveys show residents want commuter/cut-thru traffic to use the available state highways. Any directive in this goal should reflect a desire to manage traffic volumes on city streets down to and at levels generated by residents and property owners. This establishes a clear goal that can be measured to determine if the master plan goal is being met.

Some people would respond by saying we can’t deny use of public streets to the public. Very true, but that doesn’t mean commuters using village streets are entitled to a fast, uninterrupted and high speed transit through the village. This was in fact the approach taken in the Bow Mat South subdivision when a “time of day” gate was installed on Blue Sage Drive that blocks rush hour commuters. That community has never looked back on that decision.

Ultimately traffic management actions are going to be political decisions made by the Council and heavily influenced by public sentiment surrounding the specific traffic issue. The goal framing I’m suggesting won’t dictate the outcome, but I think it points us in the right direction and in alignment with community sentiment.

A long-form statement might be:

Transportation in the City is primarily supported by a system of streets developed for the purpose of providing mobility and access for residents and property owners. The street system is subject to speed limits and capacity associated with a low-density residential community.

- Speed limits should be maintained at levels that consider the safety of non-vehicular street users and be consistent with a residential community.

- The City should seek to manage traffic volume at the level generated by residents and property owners.
- Motor vehicle speeding should be controlled with traffic enforcement. Excessive traffic volumes, especially from cut-through traffic, should be addressed through traffic calming measures.
- Traffic calming measures should be specific to the issue and consider options ranging from discouraging traffic, to impeding traffic movements associated with cut-through traffic and eliminating pathways for cut-through traffic.

A short form guiding principle could be:

Manage traffic volume to the level created by residents and institutional property owners by imposing traffic calming and traffic reduction measures together with improved access and use of surrounding state highways.

I really think it's important that this goal capture the community desire to reduce or eliminate cut-thru traffic. We all recognize public streets can be used by any member of the public, but that doesn't mean it needs to be convenient for those motorists. We should give the Council a clear directive in this regard, not a goal capable of varying interpretations.

Parks and Open Space

The third bullet point is a carry-over from 2008 which isn't the least bit objectionable. My only comment is that the word "on" should be replaced with "through" unless the goal is to protect the property owners view alone.

My question is are we considering view corridors from public spaces, e. g. a park of point along a trail? I've always associated view corridors as originating at a public place. I would suggest a goal for this type of corridor.

The Village should explore creating view corridors from public locations (in parks or on trails,) especially those at risk of impairment from development or vegetation.

Finally, is undergrounding of overhead lines part of this issue?

Infrastructure

One of the most common actions by municipalities in Colorado over the last ten or fifteen years is to establish a storm drainage enterprise fund. They are used for both operating and capital costs. There are reasons why that might not happen here, e. g. lack of a current billing process. Nonetheless, I think this guiding principle should speak to improving Village financial resources for this task. Working with regional partners is fine but it won't be a free lunch.

AGB

1/25/22