



City of Littleton

Littleton Center
2255 West Berry Avenue
Littleton, CO 80120

Meeting Agenda Planning Commission

Monday, November 28, 2016

6:30 PM

Community Room

Study Session

1. Mineral Station Area Master Plan Review

- a. [ID# 16-267](#) Planning Commission Study Session on community engagement / public process comments for the Mineral Station Area planning process

Attachments: [Mineral Station Community Engagement - public comments](#)

2. Staff/Board Updates

The public is invited to attend all regular meetings or study sessions of the City Council or any City Board or Commission. Please call 303-795-3780 at least forty-eight (48) hours prior to the meeting if you believe you will need special assistance or any reasonable accommodation in order to be in attendance at or participate in any such meeting. For any additional information concerning City meetings, please call the above referenced number.



Staff Communication

File #: ID# 16-267, **Version:** 1

Agenda Date: 11/28/16

Subject:

Planning Commission Study Session on community engagement / public process comments for the Mineral Station Area planning process

Presented By: Jocelyn Mills, Community Development Director

BACKGROUND:







Earlier in September, the community development intern presented to Planning Commission an overview of the public comments received during the past several months on the Mineral Station Area planning process.

During this study session, Planning Commission will continue its review and discussion on the public input.

Mineral Light Rail Station Area

Master Plan:

Community Engagement

-  **Seven Months Collecting Public Comments**
-  **Two Open Houses**
-  **Two Community Meetings**
-  **Over Three Hundred Thirty Recorded Participants**
-  **More Than One Thousand Comments**
-  ***Countless Visions***

Public comments for the Mineral STAMP have been an exceptionally informative resource. Community input has made it possible to manage the scale and scope of this master plan through the inclusion of local knowledge. Additionally, the stewardship held by so many of Littleton’s residents act as a framework for what goals the Mineral STAMP must achieve. We are pleased to see how public comments, STAMP Visions, and the Littleton Citywide Visions complement and strengthen each other.

The spirit of public commentary is best-summarized by a member of the community who wrote, “This place cannot be all things to all people.” It would be exceedingly difficult to create a place which 100% of all residents were entirely satisfied with. Still, the feedback that the City has received will make it possible to include the sentiments of those invested in their community.

Top Subjects of Discussion	
Parking	Traffic
Density	Mixed-Use
Appropriate uses	Open Space
Pedestrian Bridge / Amenities	Privacy
Access to Aspen Grove	Preservation
Trails and Connectivity	Design

Mineral Light Rail STAMP Community Engagement

**March 16, 2016
Neighborhood Open House
and Online Survey Results**

MINERAL STATION AREA MASTER PLAN

COMMUNITY OPEN HOUSE MEETING SUMMARY | 3-16-16

On March 16, 2016 a kick-off community meeting was held for the **Mineral Station Area Master Plan** at the Carson Nature Center from 6:30pm – 8:00pm.

The community open house is part of the **Mineral Station Area Master Plan** process sponsored by the City of Littleton, the Regional Transportation District (RTD), and the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG). The Master Plan will identify priorities and actions to guide circulation and parking improvements, economic development, and land uses on and around the Mineral Station park and ride area over the next five to ten years. For more information on the Mineral Station Area Master Plan, please visit the City of Littleton project website at www.littletonplans.org

Three stations were set up with existing condition illustrations for the following topics:

1. **Land use and Livability**
2. **Transportation and Connectivity**
3. **Economic Development**

The following pages include summaries of input received at each station.

LAND USE / LIVABILITY

MINERAL STATION AREA MASTER PLAN

Existing Conditions: Land Use




Common themes discussed at the **Land Use and Livability** station included:

- Provide additional parking at the park and ride
- Create an additional buffer to the park and South Platte River – potentially include agricultural land for local, organic farming between the equine center and any new development
- Expanded the tax base
- Keep and enhance Littleton’s small town character and livability
- Provide affordable housing, accessible housing for seniors, low-income and disabled
- Provide additional lighting but no light pollution (100% cut off lights for dark skies)
- Improve safety and reduce crime
- Need for additional bus service connections
- High-density at north end (vertical mixed-use) with a grocery south but no big box stores
- Improve identity for Aspen Grove and more mix of uses including a neighborhood grocery
- Views to the river and open space should not be compromised by multi-story structures
- Pave the dirt RTD parking lot
- Be sensitive to nature and integrate new land uses
- Create a destination
- Increase restaurant or like options accessible from the bike and pedestrian trails
- Uncertainty of the potential development of the 100+ acre Ensor property on the southwest corner of Mineral and Santa Fe

TRANSPORTATION / CONNECTIVITY


MINERAL STATION AREA MASTER PLAN Existing Conditions: Transportation



Common themes discussed at the **Transportation and Connectivity** station included:

- Add safety improvements at C-470 trail crossing
- Add a grade separated crossing for pedestrians at Highline Canal
- The McCullen ditch provides an opportunity to connect to the station
- Provide structured parking with multi-use development that also serves RTD users
- Improve the first and last mile connections from the east neighborhoods
- Provide a multi-use path on the north side of Mineral west of Santa Fe rather than an on-street bike lane
- Improve ADA access from Mineral to the light rail platform
- Access to the trails are a major asset for the station and surrounding neighborhoods
- Provide bicycle/pedestrian bridges over Santa Fe, both north and south of Mineral
- Add pedestrian shelters at the bus and light rail stop
- Add additional seating along trails, not just benches but natural features such as stumps and boulders
- Increase frequency of bus service and expand hours
- Improve the pedestrian access to Aspen Grove
- Develop a permanent path from Jackass Hill neighborhoods to the LRT station sidewalk
- Need integrated traffic plan – citywide – must solve citywide (countywide) – west side
- Coordinate with Mineral Traffic Safety Study
- Improve bicycle and pedestrian wayfinding
- Increase bus circulation, perhaps with remote parking and a frequent shuttle to the RTD/Highlands Ranch Town Center parking structure
- Access to/from the Ensor property on the southwest corner of Mineral and Santa Fe – need for a new traffic signal or two on Santa Fe
- Concern for traffic that will be generated by development on the Ensor property

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT



Common themes discussed at the **Economic Development** station included:


- New development that can provide revenue to support south suburban parks
- Provide high-density housing to reduce car dependency
- Provide low profile retail (local cafes / businesses) including a full-service hotel
- Provide incubators for local businesses to succeed
- Provide a sustainable tax base - do not use TIF for new development
- This station area should have ample jobs to promote a reverse commute or no commute - high-end jobs that potentially include alternative energy and outdoor recreation companies
- The City needs sales tax revenue
- Provide sustainable housing and pedestrian oriented development
- Additional housing development must consider impact on schools
- Economic development that focuses on transit users that arrive at the station at the end of the day (i.e. grocery, daily needs)
- Provide vertical mixed-use - housing above retail, office, 2 to 4 stories
- New development should include a parking structure for the development and transit users
- Enhance Aspen Grove and relate it more to transit
- Provide quality building stock – no “cookie-cutter” development
- Provide a variety of housing, including high end and affordable senior housing and townhomes including more condos that people can own versus renting
- Preserve the character of Littleton (no Littleton village type development)
- Provide Class-A office
- Provide South Park-type office with mixed-use residential
- Think about this area as center of long term viability of area (high quality development with parking structures)
- No 24/7 or formulaic development
- Consider traffic impacts of new development

Mineral Station Online Survey – March/April 2016

Thank you for your participation in the Mineral Station Online Survey. This survey is a part of the Mineral Light Rail Station Area Master Plan process and was sponsored by the City of Littleton, the Regional Transportation District (RTD), and the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG). The Master Plan will identify priorities and actions to guide circulation/parking improvements, economic development, and land uses on and around the Mineral Station over the next five to ten years.

Of the questions asked that could be put into a graph, the following results were found:


2. To achieve your vision for Mineral Station, which of the following actions will be important?



	Very Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
Make Mineral Station more walkable and bikeable	21	13	7	5
Improve the safety of Mineral Station, including better lighting	18	13	15	1
Improve the frequency of buses	6	12	16	11
Attract neighborhood serving retail and amenities (such as grocery, pharmacy, etc.)	9	8	7	22
Improve connections between neighborhoods, trails and destinations	23	9	11	4
Improve the parking experience for customers	27	10	7	3
Provide housing at a variety of price points	6	7	12	22
Educate residents, leaders and visitors on the value of rail transit	15	10	9	13
Attract jobs	4	13	17	13
Create more events that embrace the diversity of the community	1	8	14	23
Improve way-finding signage for bikes, pedestrians, and vehicles	8	8	23	8
Other (please specify)	15	0	0	2

3. To achieve your vision for Mineral Station, which ONE of the actions from Question 2 will be the MOST important?


Chart options »



Make Mineral Station more walkable and bikeable	5
Improve the safety of Mineral Station, including better lighting	6
Attract neighborhood serving retail and amenities (such as grocery, pharmacy, etc.)	4
Improve connections between neighborhoods, trails and destinations	3
Improve the parking experience for customers	14
Provide housing at a variety of price points	2
Educate residents, leaders and visitors on the value of rail transit	2
Other	8

5. Which of the following BEST characterizes your primary interest(s) in Mineral Station?


Chart options »



User of Mineral Station	25
Surrounding resident	35
Employee near Mineral Station	2
Live in the greater Littleton Area	14

8. Age


Chart options »



18 to 24	1
25 to 34	4
35 to 49	7
50 to 64	15
Over 65	14

9. Gender


[Chart options »](#)



Male	20
Female	21

10. Race/Ethnicity


[Chart options »](#)



White	34
Other	2

11. Annual Household Income

Chart options »



● Less than \$24,999 ● \$25,000 - \$49,999 ◀ 1/3 ▶

Less than \$24,999	1
\$25,000 - \$49,999	3
\$50,000 - \$99,999	8
\$100,000 - \$199,999	17
More than \$200,000	3

Of the questions that asked for open answers, the following was gathered:

1.Looking to the future, please offer three words that best capture your vision for the future of Mineral Station by the year 2025:	4. If you could suggest one other specific improvement to enhance Mineral Station, what would that be?
parking, grocery, views Transit-oriented development	Traffic light at Mineral and Platte: traffic trying to turn left from Mineral to go North on Santa Fe gets backed up here. Can we have a designated turn lane that starts earlier? Housing
greenspace: quieter: breathable	Parking garage. Somehow relieve the car congestion nightmare that occurs on Mineral between the Platte River and Jackass Hill especially during rush hours. Extreme exhaust and noise pollution which is dangerous for both humans and the animals (living in the Park). Reduce the car traffic using this corridor overall. Consider adding a County Line Station to take some of the load off the Mineral Station. More parking that's available throughout the day.
Local small business oriented (not chains or big boxes), preserving south platte park, ped & bike friendly	
An area that is safe by car, foot, and bike that makes it easy to drop off/pick up passengers and easily pick up dinner.	A drive circle for pickup/dropoff of passengers. It is chaos and unsafe.
upscale - sustainable - safe Safe, attractive, thought-through	Higher visibility of security at all hours.
low impact and density	ban anymore high density housing
pedestrian oriented development	Provide more sheltering from the weather. Better maintenance by RTD.
Transit oriented development More Parking	Landscape improvements, repair

More parking	Multi-level parking structure
Accessible, beautiful, and useful	Access to airport, by bus.
More parking spaces	Do a better job of maintaining the pedestrian bridge.
	Restrooms / Shelter / Services (Food and Cab)
Littleton charm, Family friendly, Suburban (not urban looking)	
Accessible, safe, safety from elements	
Build Parking Garage	More parking at the Carson Nature Center
openness, ease, user-friendly	
Accessible, safe, clean	Increase the parking spaces - build a multi level structure if necessary
	Simplify, beautify. NO CAR OR TRUCK DEALERSHIPS, we don't need another Colfax, Havana or 470 corridor. And by the way, with Southglenn, Southwest Plaza, Park Meadows we don't need another huge shopping strip. Enhance what we have, promote Aspen Grove, FILL THE VACANCY
openness, uncluttered, no more traffic	
	When Mineral was extended across the river it provided Littleton with another east/west access. Today we are in need of another east/west access to make it easier to travel in those directions. Right now getting to the west side of town in the late afternoon requires about 30 minutes extra in travel time. It will only get worse if this area is developed more than it is currently.
no more traffic	Why was there no mention of open

	As the Ensor property develops - be sure there are at least two entrances on Santa Fe as well as one at the current traffic light on Mineral.
Adequate parking, improved access, and improved safety for the people using the Mineral Station	Also, improve the bus stop and passenger drop off on WB Mineral Avenue - East of Santa Fe. Don't force drop off drivers to traverse the Mineral / Santa Fe intersections multiple times just to drop off a family member at the Station. This improvement can save time and gas (monetary and environmental impacts) for the citizens of Littleton.

Empty-nester Townhouses	Bus/taxi service to Mineral Station from neighborhoods within a 2-mile radius.
Safe beautiful functional	Security
	Traffic is extremely heavy and now Prince Street is getting heavy by those that are trying to bypass Santa Fe. Reinstate the cameras because now folks are pushing the yellow light.
RTD parking improved	
Parking, housing, retail	

--	--

Adequate and safe parking	
Green space, preservation of some agricultural land for urban farming, transit friendly	
	It's time to remove the sea of parking at the station and do a comprehensive development on the north and south side of Mineral that incorporates the parking and provides other land uses, especially multi-family housing.
development and transit	Playground (natural focus)
Natural; creative; functional	More walkable trail access
green open walkable	

clean nature connected	Build the light rail south to Lucent to reduce traffic from Highlands Ranch. Too many cars at the Santa Fe & Mineral intersection.
Efficient, useful, beautiful	Better shelter and other amenities (eg restroom) for rail passengers, walkers/bikers
integrated, multipurpose, functional	Reconstruction of the Mineral/Santa Fe intersection to improve capacity and operations.
safe, non-residential, convenient enviornmentally friendly - sustainable - appropriate	parking garage with closing time, QR electronic ticketing

accessible, vibrant, affordable

Retail, parking, housing	More frequent trains.
More adequate and available parking spaces which can be used after 6:30 am	More paved parking spaces. You cannot park in Littleton or Mineral after 6:30 am. I always have to drive to Englewood station if I want to go downtown between 7:00 am and 4:00
Safety, Responsible Traffic	I do not have any complaints about the way the mineral light rail station currently is.

6. What is your favorite thing about Mineral Station?

7. What is your least favorite thing about Mineral Station?

Light rail use to go downtown.
Convenient location

Not enough parking and long dark walk from/to overflow lot.

Not many amenities nearby

The bridge.

The lack of parking. The congestion and traffic at Santa Fe

Within walking distance of my house.

The car congestion

Convenience to where I live

Not enough parking

growing restuarant options

pde access across platte river pkwy
Getting out of the parking lot - very tough left with pedestrians and bikers, blind corners, etc. It bothers me a lot that Aspen Grove has no small market to pick up food you don't have or wine/beer.

The pedestrian bridge over Santa Fe.

Proximity to Aspen Grove shops & restaurants.

The terrible parking situation, especially during the work week.

Alternative transportation

Additional traffic and pollution

Carson Nature Center

The density - the apartments west of Aspen Grove

The bridge connection across Santa fe and the view of the mountains and South Platte Park

No covered parking

Walkable from my residence

Poor maintenance by RTD

convenience to light rail	Lack of parking
Being near Aspen Grove and biking trails	Parking is quite limited
Inexpensive, convenient access to downtown Denver.	Not enough parking.
New services, nearby trails	Poor Parking / Lighting, No Shelter
Nothing	The parking experience - won't use light rail because after parking etc it is quicker to drive downtown. Plus light rail is very limited in downtown destinations.
Easy parking	Distance from where I live in littleton and lack of bus accessibility to station
The transportation convenience that Light Rail provides.	Lack of adequate number of parking spaces at the RTD Station
walkable, convenient,	
convenient distance to my house	Theft from the parking lots

THE BEAUTIFUL VIEWS AND UNCLUTTERED SKYLINE	TRAFFIC AT MINERAL AND SANTE FE
---	---------------------------------

Don't have one

Just getting there - usually go to another station to avoid the traffic and parking issues there. Wish the SkyRide was still running.

Access to RTD public transportation services.

The high crime rate.

Mineral is closest station to where I live.

Parking during weekday business hours completely fills up. Littleton station is no better. That seriously discourages senior citizens from using Light Rail for travel.

Using light rail

Too dark at night

Light rail is handy

Parking

Convenience to downtown

Access via walking

Frequency of trains.

Lack of parking

Convenient distance from my home.

Not enough parking with current parking so spread out that outlying parkers must walk a long distance to reach the station.

having light rail and I think it looks pretty as is

dirt parking lot

The pedestrian bridge.

The emphasis on parking with no adjacent housing.

Accessibility

It needs less sky polluting light

Location

Congestion

Provides light rail access to the city.	The traffic at Santa Fe & Mineral.
Pedestrian bridge over Santa Fe	Access via Mineral and Santa Fe intersection...especially traffic congestion on Mineral at rush hour
Potential	The dirt overflow parking and need for pedestrians to cross Platte River Pkwy.
choice of two lines	development that brings loitering
light rail	traffic
	The distance and unavailability of parking.
	The fact that there's no express service from Mineral to any other station; until the metro area's roadways' capacity is completely exhausted the lightrail will never be competitive vs. private autos.
Convenience for getting to downtown.	Parking
Convenience on weekends	no available parking spaces after 6:30 am
	That the overflow parking flows into the Southpark townhome
That it connects with Union Station	community.

Mineral Light Rail STAMP Community Engagement

June 2, 2016
Community Meeting
and Online Visual Preference Survey Results

MINERAL STATION AREA MASTER PLAN

COMMUNITY MEETING SUMMARY | 6-2-16

LITTLETON CITY HALL 5:30PM – 9:00 PM

The second community meeting is part of the **Mineral Station Area Master Plan** process sponsored by the City of Littleton, the Regional Transportation District (RTD), and the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG). The Master Plan will identify priorities and actions to guide circulation and parking improvements, economic development, and land uses on and around (approximately ½ mile) the Mineral Station park and ride area over the next five to ten years. For more information on the Mineral Station Area Master Plan, please visit the City of Littleton project website at www.littletonplans.org

The following pages include summaries of input received during the break out session:

Alternative 1 Comments

- Would like to see direct connection between High Line Canal and South Platte trails/park
- Relates better to area to the south
- Pedestrian scale is good with this option

Alternative 2 Comments

- Like the trail connection to the High Line Canal
- Like the location of the pedestrian bridge here
- Prefer this option – connection to river/Carson Nature Center; parking at corner will buffer retail from traffic
- Connect across Mineral
- Like connection to nature preserve with this alignment
- Better alternative to activate Aspen Grove
- Good connection to Carson Nature Center

Break Out Station General Comments

- Keep existing bridge connection from parking lot to station
- Development will increase traffic volume and bike/ped safety issues

- Better pedestrian safety needed along Mineral Ave east of Santa Fe Dr
- What is the demand for parking at the station in the future? (Consider things like population growth)
- Expand parking at Carson Nature Center
- Development vs. transportation hub vs. destination demand
- Riverwalk to Breckenridge Brewery
- Respect wildlife throughout the South Platte corridor
- All generations
- Better lighting
- 3-4-5 story buildings depending on location
- Destination for families – something fun (e.g., Ferris wheel)
- Easement trail
- Retail and restaurants looking over the river
- Wrap parking
- Tapered development from Santa Fe Dr down to the river
- Intense, job producing development south of Mineral, along Santa Fe Dr
- Bus shuttle to overflow parking
- Mixed income and mixed generation housing
- Move light rail line (swinging it on to west side of Santa Fe Dr where the stop is) to create more value on the site
- Need direct connections to make it easy to access station area
- Like south of Mineral for office/campus – prefer high-tech focus
- Attract businesses that will attract people that use alternative modes of transportation
- Need “cute, small town neighborhood”
- More parking at the Carson Nature Center
- Focus on long-term sustainability of retail/business
- Only two stories for all uses in the study area
- Need connection for southbound bike/ped trail
- Better access to Aspen Grove
- More parking at Nature Center
- Need better signage from park-n-ride to trail/nature center
- Save the trees
- Connect to High Line (need signage and trail)
- Like Dad Clark Gulch connection
- Difficult access to station from neighborhood southeast of Santa Fe/Mineral intersection
- Wildlife use open space along Mineral east of station, and up to Jackass Hill Park

- Three story max to any structures
- Support including parking structure with wrap retail
- Support tying in to Aspen Grove more
- Limited parking near South Platte River trails
- Barrington, IL is a good TOD example
- Jackass Hill wildlife not good – too much ped traffic
- Architecture – more pitched roofs (Park Meadows style)
- Taper height of buildings
- Mixed ideas on Jackass Hill
- Paved trails
- Better (i.e. straight) connection to the river
- Separate LRT crossing for bikes going to river
- *Note on maps – show C-470 and County Line on future maps*
- Ensor site will have to be built higher/use fill, due to flood issues
- Variety of housing types (1-story senior; income variety; detached and attached townhomes) – market to those downsizing
- Something new and interesting at the station that brings people to the station area and Littleton
- Allow scooters on the trails
- More for-sale housing
- Age-targeted (not age-restricted) housing
- Concerned about housing affordability
- Build parking at RTD/in Highlands Ranch – shuttle to Mineral
- Pedestrian-oriented development
- Senior housing
- Moderately priced housing
- Architectural character of Littleton
- Connect Aspen Grove
- Near term idea – bus/car drop-off at station
- Be careful with retail competition
- Bus drop-off/“Kiss-n-Ride”
- Residents/elected officials to work with owner to change the zoning
- Like the bike/ped connection running along City Ditch and good open space buffers
- Flood plain is concerning
- Need underpass at Platte Valley and Mineral
- Already vacancies at Aspen Grove – would new retail survive?
- Overpass over Mineral at S Platte Pkwy

- Housing – spread throughout
- 5-6 stories along Santa Fe, 2-3 to preserve views
- There is too much next to the river (creating a “wall”)
- Southlands/Vistas at Park Meadows as examples
- Change name to “Littleton Station” – to brand with the city
- Overpass over Mineral
- Commercial immediately adjacent to Santa Fe
- Keep City Ditch
- Save the barn
- Riverwalk along the Ditch
- Wrap the parking – retail, restaurants, residential
- Use station as driver for Aspen Grove
- Maintain buffer between park and development
- Who do we want this area to serve over long-term?
- Garage with retail around
- Like connections across RTD
- Height of parking structures – lower on overflow area, higher on existing lot
- Variation in heights and intensity – lower on river and higher on Santa Fe
- No consensus on building heights – some okay with 5 stories, some okay with 3-4 stories, and others only lower
- Use land/topography to fit building/garage into property
- Better connection to back of Aspen Grove
- Connect Aspen Grove to face RTD as well
- Regional driver for Littleton – be creative
- Build a community centered around RTD site
- Do not need more retail
- Unsafe
- Better connection to river
- Need more pedestrian connections across rail tracks
- Create pull-out for drop-off at station
- Like outdoor oriented retail, but low profile buildings
- Need trails to E Trail (i.e. from Dad Clark Gulch)
- People will not reverse commute
- Create a destination
- No big box
- No tall buildings – protect the view to river and mountains


- Parking structure must be free
- No dirt lot
- No parking after 6:45 am
- Aspen Grove has enough retail – don't need more
- Bus circulator is not good
- Architecture must fit Littleton (timber, brick)
- Need for design guidelines
- Could you do a 2-3 story parking structure on the dirt lot?
- Better connection for existing retail at Aspen Grove
- Parking should be only for transit center (double parking)
- TOD not critical at this site
- Think about upcoming generations mobility desires
- Let the market drive development
- Include a library
- Parking always full
- Power/sewer/water needs for large campus
- Intuitive design of parking garage
- Parking variation during different times of year
- Intersection needs a PPP
- Long-term parking
- Retail or restaurant on top of structure with view
- Multiple ped bridges
- Bike lanes/safety – separate users
- Push SSPR
- Long-term solutions to Santa Fe
- Parking and taller buildings along Santa Fe – for a noise barrier
- Financing important for mixed development
- What are the numbers for value capture?
- Residents do not have confidence in city leadership
- Fill empty retail in downtown and Aspen Grove first
- Connect this with the hospital
- Circulators?
- Need comprehensive plan addressing population growth, with different scenarios

MINERAL STATION AREA MASTER PLAN Site Influences



MINERAL STATION AREA MASTER PLAN

VISION: URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK- OPTION 1



LEGEND

- EXISTING PARKS AND OPEN SPACE
- WATER
- EXISTING TRAILS
- - - RECOMMENDED TRAIL CONNECTIONS
- EXISTING STREETS
- - - RECOMMENDED NEW STREETS

URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK PLAN


- ENHANCED STREETS
- ACCESS POINTS
- PARKS AND OPEN SPACE
- PARK DISTRICT
- STATION DISTRICT
- - - COMMERCIAL & RESIDENTIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT



JUNE 2016

MINERAL STATION AREA MASTER PLAN

VISION: URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK- OPTION 2



LEGEND

- EXISTING PARKS AND OPEN SPACE
- WATER
- EXISTING TRAILS
- RECOMMENDED TRAIL CONNECTIONS
- EXISTING STREETS
- RECOMMENDED NEW STREETS

URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK PLAN


- ENHANCED STREETS
- ACCESS POINTS
- PARKS AND OPEN SPACE
- PARK DISTRICT
- STATION DISTRICT
- COMMERCIAL & RESIDENTIAL PLANNED DEVELOPMENT



JUNE 2016

LITTLETON MINERAL STATION AREA PLAN

TRAIL & GREENWAY CONNECTIONS



LEGEND

- LITTLETON CITY LIMITS
- GREENWAYS AND PARKLAND
- WATER
- EXISTING TRAILS
- PROPOSED TRAIL CONNECTIONS
- ACTIVITY NODES



MINERAL STATION AREA MASTER PLAN

VISION: NEAR TERM IDEAS



Mineral Station Combined Visual Preference Polling

Session Name

Online Session

Date Created

6/27/2016 6:43:12 PM

Active Participants

76

Questions

41

Applied weights to answers to give a weighted score

	Responses
	Weight
It's great!	3.0
It's good	2.0
Just fine	1.0
Not preferred	-1.0
No thanks	-3.0

Results by Question

1. What is your zip code? (Online Respondents Only)

	Online Responses	
	Percent	Count
80120	80.00%	8
80122	10.00%	1
80128	10.00%	1
Other	0.00%	0
Totals	100%	10


2a. How Long have you lived in Littleton? (Online Respondents Only)

	Online Responses	
	Percent	Count
YEARS		
1-5	10.00%	1
6-10	30.00%	3
11-20	30.00%	3
20+	30.00%	3
Totals	100%	10

2b. How old are you? (Online Respondents Only)


	Online Responses	
	Percent	Count
YEARS		
20-29 years	10.00%	1
30-39 years	0.00%	0
40-49 years	30.00%	3
50-59 years	20.00%	2
60-69 years	20.00%	2
70-79 years	20.00%	2
Totals	100%	10

3 Neighborhood Scale Retail/Commercial
How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	17.11%	13
It's good	38.16%	29
Just fine	23.68%	18
Not preferred	15.79%	12
No thanks	5.26%	4
Totals	100%	76
Weighted Score		1.20


4. Neighborhood Scale Retail/Commercial
How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	6.67%	5
It's good	12.00%	9
Just fine	18.67%	14
Not preferred	21.33%	16
No thanks	41.33%	31
Totals	100%	75
Weighted Score		-0.83

5. In-Line Retail Center


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



	Responses	
	Percent	Count
It's great!	10.81%	8
It's good	16.22%	12
Just fine	22.97%	17
Not preferred	21.62%	16
No thanks	28.38%	21
Totals	100%	74
Weighted Score	-0.19	

6. Neighborhood Grocery


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



	Responses	
	Percent	Count
It's great!	16.22%	12
It's good	22.97%	17
Just fine	24.32%	18
Not preferred	18.92%	14
No thanks	17.57%	13
Totals	100%	74
Weighted Score	0.47	

7. Entertainment/Movie Theater


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



	Responses	
	Percent	Count
It's great!	9.21%	7
It's good	6.58%	5
Just fine	7.89%	6
Not preferred	28.95%	22
No thanks	47.37%	36
Totals	100%	76
Weighted Score	-1.22	

8. Large Format Retail


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



	Responses	
	Percent	Count
It's great!	5.48%	4
It's good	2.74%	2
Just fine	19.18%	14
Not preferred	28.77%	21
No thanks	43.84%	32
Totals	100%	73
Weighted Score	-1.19	

9. Large Format Retail


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	8.22%	6
It's good	16.44%	12
Just fine	21.92%	16
Not preferred	27.40%	20
No thanks	26.03%	19
Totals	100%	73
Weighted Score		-0.26

10. Neighborhood Scale Medical Office

How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?




Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	6.67%	5
It's good	22.67%	17
Just fine	22.67%	17
Not preferred	29.33%	22
No thanks	18.67%	14
Totals	100%	75
Weighted Score		0.03

11. Low-rise Office

How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Low-rise Office



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	8.96%	6
It's good	11.94%	8
Just fine	20.90%	14
Not preferred	16.42%	11
No thanks	41.79%	28
Totals	100%	67


Weighted Score -0.70

12. Mid-rise Suburban Office

How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Mid-rise Suburban Office




Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	5.41%	4
It's good	2.70%	2
Just fine	4.05%	3
Not preferred	16.22%	12
No thanks	71.62%	53
Totals	100%	74

Weighted Score -2.05

13. Regional Medical


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	12.16%	9
It's good	12.16%	9
Just fine	22.97%	17
Not preferred	16.22%	12
No thanks	36.49%	27
Totals	100%	74
Weighted Score	-0.42	

14. Outdoor Retail Campus


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	10.96%	8
It's good	13.70%	10
Just fine	34.25%	25
Not preferred	20.55%	15
No thanks	20.55%	15
Totals	100%	73
Weighted Score	0.12	

15. Medical Office


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	6.85%	5
It's good	12.33%	9
Just fine	23.29%	17
Not preferred	26.03%	19
No thanks	31.51%	23
Totals	100%	73
Weighted Score	-0.52	

16. Innovative/Co-working Space

How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?




Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	8.00%	6
It's good	16.00%	12
Just fine	28.00%	21
Not preferred	16.00%	12
No thanks	32.00%	24
Totals	100%	75
Weighted Score	-0.28	

17. Innovative/Manufacturing Uses

How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?

Innovative/Manufacturing Uses




Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	8.11%	6
It's good	16.22%	12
Just fine	25.68%	19
Not preferred	17.57%	13
No thanks	32.43%	24
Totals	100%	74
Weighted Score	-0.32	

18. Light Industrial/Maker Space

How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?

Light Industrial/Maker Space




Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	3.95%	3
It's good	7.89%	6
Just fine	13.16%	10
Not preferred	27.63%	21
No thanks	47.37%	36
Totals	100%	76
Weighted Score	-1.29	

19. Light Industrial/Maker Space

How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?

Light Industrial/Maker Space




Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	8.00%	6
It's good	8.00%	6
Just fine	29.33%	22
Not preferred	24.00%	18
No thanks	30.67%	23
Totals	100%	75
Weighted Score	-0.47	

20. Single Use Parking Structure


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?

Single Use Parking Structure




Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	20.00%	14
It's good	18.57%	13
Just fine	17.14%	12
Not preferred	20.00%	14
No thanks	24.29%	17
Totals	100%	70
Weighted Score	0.21	

21. Mixed-Use Parking Structure
How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	36.49%	27
It's good	18.92%	14
Just fine	18.92%	14
Not preferred	12.16%	9
No thanks	13.51%	10
Totals	100%	74
Weighted Score	1.14	

22. Mixed-Use Parking Structure
How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?




Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	31.94%	23
It's good	15.28%	11
Just fine	22.22%	16
Not preferred	18.06%	13
No thanks	12.50%	9
Totals	100%	72
Weighted Score	0.93	

23. Low Density Attached Housing

How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Low Density Attached Housing



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	16.22%	12
It's good	24.32%	18
Just fine	27.03%	20
Not preferred	21.62%	16
No thanks	10.81%	8
Totals	100%	74

Weighted Score


0.70

24. Live-Work Housing

How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Live-Work Housing




Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	14.86%	11
It's good	21.62%	16
Just fine	22.97%	17
Not preferred	29.73%	22
No thanks	10.81%	8
Totals	100%	74

Weighted Score

0.49

25. Low Density Housing-Townhomes


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	6.67%	5
It's good	16.00%	12
Just fine	22.67%	17
Not preferred	26.67%	20
No thanks	28.00%	21
Totals	100%	75
Weighted Score		-0.36

26. Low Density Housing-Townhomes Mixed-income


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	15.07%	11
It's good	15.07%	11
Just fine	34.25%	25
Not preferred	16.44%	12
No thanks	19.18%	14
Totals	100%	73
Weighted Score		0.36

27. Senior Housing Mixed-income


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



	Responses	
	Percent	Count
It's great!	8.33%	6
It's good	16.67%	12
Just fine	30.56%	22
Not preferred	26.39%	19
No thanks	18.06%	13
Totals	100%	72
Weighted Score	0.08	

28. Medium Density Housing


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



	Responses	
	Percent	Count
It's great!	9.46%	7
It's good	10.81%	8
Just fine	16.22%	12
Not preferred	36.49%	27
No thanks	27.03%	20
Totals	100%	74
Weighted Score	-0.51	

29. Medium Density Housing Mixed-income



How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	5.26%	4
It's good	3.95%	3
Just fine	19.74%	15
Not preferred	10.53%	8
No thanks	60.53%	46
Totals	100%	76
Weighted Score		-1.49


30. High Density Housing

How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?




Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	22.67%	17
It's good	16.00%	12
Just fine	12.00%	9
Not preferred	21.33%	16
No thanks	28.00%	21
Totals	100%	75
Weighted Score		0.07

31. How well does this design feature fit with your vision for the Mineral Station area?
How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	58.11%	43
It's good	14.86%	11
Just fine	21.62%	16
Not preferred	4.05%	3
No thanks	1.35%	1
Totals	100%	74
Weighted Score	2.18	


32. S. Platte River Access
How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	49.30%	35
It's good	18.31%	13
Just fine	19.72%	14
Not preferred	9.86%	7
No thanks	2.82%	2
Totals	100%	71
Weighted Score	1.86	

33. S. Platte River Access


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



	Responses	
	Percent	Count
It's great!	56.16%	41
It's good	17.81%	13
Just fine	16.44%	12
Not preferred	5.48%	4
No thanks	4.11%	3
Totals	100%	73
Weighted Score	2.03	

34. Waterfront Development Buffered by Park


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



	Responses	
	Percent	Count
It's great!	30.67%	23
It's good	22.67%	17
Just fine	21.33%	16
Not preferred	12.00%	9
No thanks	13.33%	10
Totals	100%	75
Weighted Score	1.07	

35. Waterfront Development Buffered by Park


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	32.39%	23
It's good	23.94%	17
Just fine	19.72%	14
Not preferred	16.90%	12
No thanks	7.04%	5
Totals	100%	71
Weighted Score	1.27	

36. Neighborhood Park/Open Space


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	35.53%	27
It's good	21.05%	16
Just fine	23.68%	18
Not preferred	9.21%	7
No thanks	10.53%	8
Totals	100%	76
Weighted Score	1.32	

37. Community Gardens/Urban Agriculture


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	47.30%	35
It's good	9.46%	7
Just fine	24.32%	18
Not preferred	12.16%	9
No thanks	6.76%	5
Totals	100%	74
Weighted Score	1.53	

38. Enhanced Street Crossings


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



Responses		
	Percent	Count
It's great!	39.19%	29
It's good	21.62%	16
Just fine	25.68%	19
Not preferred	12.16%	9
No thanks	1.35%	1
Totals	100%	74
Weighted Score	1.70	

39. Enhanced Street Crossings


How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



	Responses	
	Percent	Count
It's great!	41.10%	30
It's good	20.55%	15
Just fine	21.92%	16
Not preferred	13.70%	10
No thanks	2.74%	2
Totals	100%	73
Weighted Score	1.64	

40. Streetscape Character

How well does this development form fit with your vision for Mineral Station?



	Responses	
	Percent	Count
It's great!	44.83%	13
It's good	17.24%	5
Just fine	20.69%	6
Not preferred	13.79%	4
No thanks	3.45%	1
Totals	100%	29
Weighted Score	1.66	

Mineral Light Rail STAMP Community Engagement

July 26, 2016
Community Meeting
and Online Alternative Scenario Polling Results

Mineral Station Area Plan Alternative Development Scenario Survey

Submission Details

1. What do you like about Option #1?
New foot paths and trails to access this area
THE MOST PARKING
River walk and public open spaces
Several things: pedestrian linkages, connection to AG, City Ditch Trail,
Mixed-use development, open space, pass through to Aspen Grove
Nothing
Emphasis on walkability. Mixed-use construction.
The new pedestrian bridge and the multi-level parking structure
I like this location of the new led bridge and the access to the trails and AG
Leaves some open spaces
I like the idea of a parking structure.
More commuter parking for lightrail
Mostly residential (townhouses, not apartments); takes advantage of park for residents instead of office workers or retailers
The mixed use nature of the plan, with parking and housing. I also like that the open space currently there maintains its integrity
new pedestrian bridge
Trail connections to the parks
#9
Nothing
All of the trail connections. The Parking structure. Walking access to Aspen Grove
Trails will be good assuming bikes are allowed.
nothing
I like that you are adding trails and connecting to Mary Carter Trail
Nothing
Not much
Additonal parking.
More parking?
It appears to be the least complicated, very clean, most parking

The amount of townhomes & extra parking
3 and 4 for easier access to Aspen Grove
Increased parking for lightrail
mixed use housing and business as well as connection to bike trail
new trail connectios , pass though to Aspen Grove, Dad Clark undrpass
Increasing pedestrian options.
Trail connections, parking structure
More trail connections
#14 because of the open space but it needs to be much bigger and expand into South Platte Park.
Nothing
Garage Parking, Riverwalk
new trails and trail connections; #9 (new ped bridge).
Overall enhanced access and walk ability. I'll highlight the new pedestrian bridge #9 for improved access and safety
parking garage
I like the mix of retail & open space
Access to Highline and Jackass Hill Park, New pedestrian bridge closer to light rail, Riverwalk open space
ample parking, pedestrian pass-through (#4)
Access via trails to communities
I like the new pedestrian bridge #9 and trail connection. Also parking
Parking structure, new bridge and trail connections
like #14 City Ditch Open Space
Parking structure, wrapped with mixed use; additional open space/plaza
The light rail station remains open
Mixed-use development wrapped around parking structure and townhomes.
More parking for the light rail station
Lower residential density than option 2
additional pedestrian bridge and dad clark underpass. I also like that the pkg garage is wrapped in retail and residential
The multi-level garage - can you build it to add floors in the future?
Mixed use and higher density. Better connectivity to aspen grove
7 / 9 / low amount of office space

I like all the connections and mixed use where appropriate. I like the additional parking.	
	8
pedestrian access to Aspen Grove	
1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16. This plan has the most parking	
Connection with East and West sides of Sante Fe, parking structure need met, riverwalk ,and mixed use development	
Parking garage is definatly needed!	
pedestrian access and pass through to Aspen Grove	
The formal pass through to Aspen Grove (#4) is a nice addition	
It maintains open undeveloped ag land and open space vistas to the river south of Mineral.	
Plaza	
Parks and parking garage for light rail station	
The town homes	
Maximizes parking with good parks and open space.	
The location of the new pedestrian bridge and the additional pedestrian access to Aspen Grove	
Parking structure	
The pedestrian access/pass through to Aspen Grove, trail connection to Jackass Hill and High Line Canal	
Improved access to trails and Aspen Grove, townhomes by river/open space	
Looks like there would be more light rail parking. I also like the additional walking paths in the area.	
seems logical. trail connectivity.	
My #2 option: second bridge, ped access to Aspen Grove, more open space than 2, more parking space	
Parking garage only	
Adds retail south of Mineral	
The opporunity for housing, and the trail connections are great. I like wrapped parking and the retail and housing above it.	
Open space and pedestrian access;	
Nothing	
Nothing!!!!	
Great - and sorely needed- connections between Aspen Grove and the site; structured parking is necessary to support de	
Pedestrian bridge closer to parking and Aspen Grove	
I like the pedi bridge with trail connection	

I like the parking structure w/ mixed use around it. I also like the included open space.
Pedestrian access to shopping center. I like the additional pedestrian bridge too.
City Ditch left open, not piped; Parking structure close to light rail, pedestrian connectivity to Aspen Grove
Pedestrian bridge (new), parking structure wrapped
The addition of a parking structure, #8.
Parking size is ok
I like it. Make sure the parking garage is three, not two levels. (I live across Sante Fe and the view will not be obstructed)
Parking is improved
More parking, shaded parking, and pedestrian access points.
Trail connection
Additional open space and trail connections. Glad to see planning for additional entrances to Ensor property on Santa Fe.
the very small amount of open space is what some people in man hat"
I like the new pedestrian bridge.

2. What do you not like about Option #1?

City Ditch users must still cross Mineral Ave at grade level further impeding vehicle traffic.

LOOKS SIMPLER

Too many townhomes and multi family residences

It seems you are not doing anything for the Ensor property, why not? There is no need for a second pedestrian bridge over SF Dr.

Possibly very dense

Parking is the issue

Parking structure obscures "front door" of Mineral Station. 2nd foot bridge over Santa Fe is unnecessary.

Need more parking spaces due to already congested parking

Will add traffic to an already congested area. Littleton has serious East/West route issues.

Adding MORE housing to an already busy intersection

Additional office & residential impact on commuter parking for light rail

Too much focus on parking in overwhelming 4-level garage dominating high visibility corner.

egr

parking structure

multi family housing

Just don't block the views of the houses on jackass hill

Where is the parking for light rail??? Why do we need more high density residential???

The residential on the parking garage. Should have adequate space for light rail parking, not to compete with business or resid

No mention of how many levels on multi level parking structure. Height blocks view? Future mixed use area (13) vague.

everything

the trail requires us to cross over Mineral, a VERY busy street to get to 14 on the south side trail; not good alt 9

#5, #7, #8, #13

Don't need more high density development

WI live in SouthPark II and am concerned about #15, the new trail connections. We DO NOT WANT MORE TRAFFIC/FOOT near

Why is there a new pedestrian bridge when there is already one existing?

I hate parking garages with housing on top. Why are all options only exploring above ground parking? Can we not dig down?

9-12 will negatively impact the residential area--haven't they suffered enough with the train/light rail debauche?!
There is no retail added
#9 is not needed, already have a pedestrian bridge at the station. Way too much retail, office and apartments
None
nothing
mixed use, business and retail options. Aspen Grove is right there already with empty and struggling retail
I would like #14 (open space) to be larger.
Future mixed development on current open space, additional townhouse development
I do not like the high-density mixed-use development area. Make it a green space.
High Density Housing
High occupancy.
#8 if it's a paid parking structure. OK if it's free.
Unclear if #9 gives immediate access to light rail or if people have to cross to parking lot first then back to LR.
nothing
Increased traffic at Mineral & S Platte Pkwy
More retail around parking structure and in #5 - seems like Aspen Grove has empty space - do we need this?
Not enough parking
Not sure
Would love to see houses built in open areas instead of more retail
Do not need more rental properties in Littleton, especially #7 backing up to South Platte Park. Why new ped bridge over SantaFe
Absence of intersection flexibility
This an end of line station and should be extended south and west
More townhomes being made, removal of the 7-11 gas station it seems..
4 level parking garage - too tall for that location
The number of planned townhomes and apartments
Nothing
I'd rather it not be developed at all!

It may not be dense enough for a light rail station.
the possibility of the parking structure building being too large creating an eye sore
#7 being directly across from the nature preserve, option #3 has more open space
#7 and # 5 are horrible ideas. The area is already terribly congested with traffic.
Maybe the new #9 is not needed.
future mixed use developement
I do NOT like the additional overpass walk way (#9)- that's a waste of resources. Additionally do we REALLY need more townh
It places three-story architecture right up against the park--there should be landscaped transitional space that preserves views
The housing, increased traffic, not enough parking.
Housing, both the town homes and multi-family housing
Bad idea for multi family.
Not as creative with the layout and probably the least opportunity for aesthetics.
Way too much parking
We don't need mirhouses we need more parking
Concerned about size of #8
More retail and homes in the area would burden the already crowded intersection
enough density and/or activity to create a destination/place?
Need more detail on the "Development program" where are those things supposed to be?
Conjested, condensed and crowded licing space.Too many additional people and car for existing contersection.
Eliminates much needed overflow parking at light rail station (block "7")
It may have too much multi-family housing above the parking. It will give it a lot of height, which maynot match the area.
townhomes and high density next to park; 4 level parking structure
South Platte Park is a natural space that needs to be protected, there can be no further development on its edge.
Parking garage, destroying our beautiful open spaces in 13, 14 and 16 for retail?!
Potential conflict w/townhome guest parking and station parking - can see station users trying to park on any available surface
Office development does not seem to fit in this location
The additional residential areas
new ped bridge is not needed. And will not be use much at all.

Somewhat concerned about traffic congestion especially with more residential units being added.
Large parking structure.
Two pedestrian bridges over Santa Fe would be nice but not sure it's a priority due to cost.
Possible size of parking/housing structure
The addition of town homes, #7.
Area 7 is needed in this design as more parking. West side of city ditch should be for park expansion
Should the pedestrian bridge be further North for access by those neighbors?
Ped bridge
Risk to wetlands and lack of bicycle parking.
Too many new homes no need for retail. We should have grocery in existing aspen grove
New townhomes (#7), 4 level parking garage, additional retail space when Aspen Grove has many vacant stores.
a 4 story parking structure is absurd, totally un needed and wrong
There are too many units. This community is changing from a small town feel to urban living.
4 level parking structure.
a.) the pedestrian bridge doesn't connect with the bridge to the light rail stop.
Looks like a sea of concrete - like it is very high density and that it would negatively impact the river area.

3. Do you have any other comments regarding Option #1?

I really like adding many more parking spaces in a covered garage!

NO MENTION OF BUS STATION

So, you are adding a lot of traffic to the area, what traffic improvements are planned?

Would prefer a foot bridge over Mineral to serve future mixed use #13.

None

I like the idea of #5

Aspen Grove is starting to lose tenants; several empty store fronts seems to suggest additional retail may not be successful.

If RTD extension to Highlands Ranch happens, we may not need so much parking here.

I also like the new ped access to Aspen Grove, so we don't have to climb through the bushes!

see #2

Concerned about traffic on Mineral, which is already backed up during rush hour. No other way to get into our neighborhood.

Why do you feel the need to develop every piece of open land.

recommend you take 14 and put it west along platte park instead of making us walk in mixed zone.

Apartment complexes are reducing the quality of life in Littleton.

Mineral station needs more parking spaces period!

Concerned about the height of the parking structures. Preserving mountain views for homes is vital. Alamo is pushing it.

How about some affordable, single family homes?
Not my favorite
This area is already over crowded, Have any of you tried driving on Santa Fe pretty much any time of day?
None
Much too much.
It's not entirely clear which items are new. Is it only the items marked "New"?
Get rid of adding more housing to the mix!
This seems like it's adding a LOT of people in a small space where parking is already very limited
Need a bridge to get over to #13, from #8 area.
Would like to see security issues related to increased foot traffic Eric to be explicitly addressed.
no
Love the idea of parking structure and residential in RTD lots
Where is the existing 7-11?
this is the best of the three
no
add ped bridge across Mineral Ave instead of a new one across SantaFe!
Like additional ped bridge and underpass, though expect they are costly
Why are you tying in the neighborhood into this. It's a lite rail stop unless you make it a hub for lines east west and south
Why is a new pedestrian bridge and north Aspen Grove access needed?
How does this development affect the bird (and other animals) habitat at Carson?

Concern about foot traffic towards highline canal
no
western park of 13 -should remain open space or park development
No more "homes" and "offices" please. The current streets cannot handle more traffic!
We are becoming a city inundated with apartments, rentals & townhomes. It brings an unwanted transient element to the
This survey design does only accommodate sound bites--it prevents fully answering the questions.
Don't want the high density development.
More office space would be wonderful. Littleton empties eastward every morning let's get some professional jobs here.
Widen roads and intersection.
autonomous vehicles will make that amount of parking irrelevant and if developed, it will seem shortsighted
There are 9 empty inline stores at Aspen Grove we don't need more
townhomes seems to detach future development to south from Aspen Grove
increase limit on text box. What is occurring in red outlined space, is it all #13 that indicates mix-use?
Who wants to live across the street from railroad. Why is that never mentioned?
Nothing else.
Strong concerns on traffic due to high density housing and Littleton's crown jewel South Platte Park. Space here is too limited
Further development near south platte park will ruin the ecosystem and safety of animals.
I moved to Littleton and specifically Jack Ass Hill for the views. This option destroys our small town feel that people move
Creates a nice "place" near 5/6 and current Aspen Grove
Traffic is already a mess coming down mineral towards Santa Fe. More people who live there means more traffic.

Sometimes I take light rail to the shopping center and there is no clearly defined path to get to the shopping center. It
I like the suggestion for another access point under Santa Fe.
Littleton's growing population needs more open space - use this great opportunity to add much more
Improving paths from neighborhoods across Santa Fe a must.
don't need ped bridge due to proximity to existing ped bridge
How much does this increase the capacity for parking? What about bikes?
The Mineral/Santa Fe intersection is a bottleneck for traffic, especially WB. A passenger drop off area on E side would h
shocked that whoever on this development board somehow convinces themselves that this is good for littleton.
This area is already overcrowded. Further development only fuels the housing bubble which will eventually burst.
If you are walking down the hill you have to go around to get on the rail. #8 should not have housing, only #13
What about traffic? Mineral and Santa Fe are already an issue.

4. What do you like best about Option #2?
New Dad Clark Gulch underpass and trail connection & the "maker" campus
NUMBER 5
not much
Nothing
neighborhood park
Not much
Adding greenspace with new park #4. New pedestrian bridge seems better placed than Option 1
More parking and the pedestrian bridge by Aspen Grove
Looks like less condensed housing.
I like the proposed layout better. And #9.
Even more commuter parking than option #1.
Lower garage, less strip mall feeling, low frontage on Mineral. Prefer option A.
Once again, appreciate the mixed use. I also like the trail connection to Jackass Hill
Maker Campus, retail building
new pedestrian bridge
Good new and existing access to existing trails - some new trails and open area
Parking garage as additional parking is sorely needed for the light rail.
trail connections.
Less congested housing wise than #1
nothing
Nice plan except for the residential aspect.
Less high density. More parking spaces
Additional parking
doesn't appear to be significantly different from option 1

The pedestrian bridge still neg. impacts residential area but it is further north--how about even closer to ACC?
Location of pedestrian bridge into Aspen Grove, perfect amount of retail
#5 access to Aspen Grove
Increased parking for lightrail, trail connections
bridge and play area
new trail connctions, pedestrian bridge and access to Aspen Grove. Some residenial and park
Increased pedestrian options.
trail connections and neighborhood parks, parking structure
The pedestrian bridge closer to the shopping center
Nothing
Nothing
Park, New Trails & pedestrian access to east side of Santa fe
new trails and pedestrial bridge
Overall improved accessibility. #11 and 12 especially since they improve across to LR from east of Santa Fe
parking garage and business development
Office park on NW side
Neighborhood park, townhome plan seems better than option #1
Aspen Grove connectivity
More parking.
Pedestrian bridge and access to neighborthood
Love the additional parking Option #2 offers, Mineral Station parking is always full. Like the neighborhood par
office against South Platte Park instead of rental residences, like City Ditch Open Space
Again like parking structure, though missing wrap;
. T
The parkis nice
Location of residential buildings
pedestrian access to aspen grove
The office park
More parking
3 / 11 / 12 / 15 / 16

I like the increased parking spaces and the concept of the office maker campus just not where it is.
Office
pedestrian bridge
#7 location is better than 1st plan, #9 good spot for retail, #8, #1, #4, #11, #14, #15, #16
I like this one too
The location of the new bridge, further north. Dad Clark underpass.
Parking structure needed for light rail
new trail connections
I like the 3 level parking structure. This is the best of the 3 options.
Here also, it leaves the ag and open space south of Mineral alone.
Neighborhood park, office buildings
Number 8 parking
Good split of multi-family to townhomes.
The office/residential campus is a great idea
Less housing
The same as with Option #1, the access to Aspen Grove and to the High Line Canal/Jackass Hill
Improved access to trails
pathway to connect to Jackass Hill Park and High Line Canal
the efforts to address Mineral Ave. as a gateway
I like the office/maker space
Parking garage only.
Better use of parcel 7 for office
That it is a mixed use development and allows for future mixed use development
Office maker campus versus high density housing along park; easier access to retail; housing next to parking
No
10 & 11, this path is dangerous as is an steps need to be added down to Mineral
Ped connection from existing neighborhood to east; better trail connections east of 85
Nothing

Increased retail and commercial property means increased income for the city.
Pedestrian access to shopping center
#7-B
Town homes on North Side of parking structure closer to retail.
Love the garage size Best design of the 3 options
improved train connections, pedestrian bridge. Parking!
I do not like
Additional parking.
Density of housing looks much more spread and less intrusive. Love the neighborhood park
Additional open space and trail connections; inclusion of office space; 2 level parking garage (795/level)
the 3 story parking is better than 4, but with no options seems slightly forced to choose.
more office space
#11, #4

5. What do you not like about Option #2?

Fewer parking spaces than in Option #1

LESS PARKING

Too many townhomes

Everything. Why a trail connection east of RR on private property? You are suggesting a neighborhood park where the RTD odd place for pedestrian bridge, less connection to Aspen Grove

Parking is the issue here. We do not need business and townhomes

Single story retail fronting Mineral.

Still would like an additional pedestrian bridge placed as shown in option 1

Really prefer to leave the South side of mineral undeveloped or as open space

#6. Adding more housing to an already busy intersection.

#9-skip the retail and consider MORE commuter parking.

Least open space, no "Riverwalk," too many apartments in option B, too dense.

I wonder about so much office space with Southpark up the road not being filled.

multi family housing

4.45 acres of open space is on the low side. Too much new residential with Option B

pedestrian bridge needs to stay at mineral ave.

Too many high density residences. We do not need more of these in Littleton.

poor placement of ped bridge. #9 on Mineral.

Vague plans on #13.

9, no cross over at lightrail like #1 had. just bad flow and energy in this one

#6, #7, #13

The office space vs. more parking

#15 is concerning, as a Southpark owner. New Bridge #3. concerned about the height of everything. Need to preserve mountain

parking space numbers? #8 in description says 795 spaces per level, development program says 485 spaces per level.

Impact on existing neighborhoods on the east side of Santa fe.
Reduced open space, Option B has too many multi-family units, Don't like location of townhomes
Pretty much everything else, too much overbuild
None
nothing
office complex
Less parking provided.
office and retail development
Exposed parking structure, instead of having a wrapped parking structure
Pedestrian bridge to Aspen Grove is highly unnecessary. It's an easy walk from Mineral station. #7, #8, #6, #9, #13
High Density Housing
Concerned about height of parking structure & lack of parking
#8 if it's a paid structure... if Free, it's OK.
A local access bridge the the LR similar to #9 in 1st scenario would be good for bad weather.
nothing
Townhomes packed in behind parking garage
new pedestrian bridge is not practical in that location. won't be used much.
office/"maker" campus - wtf?
Not enough parking
Office space- plenty of empty office spaces elsewhere...
add ped bridge across Mineral Ave instead of a new one across SantaFe!
Absence of connection to/across retail spaces; new ped bridge is distant from light rail access
Leave the neighborhood alone to be developed be developers not the city
Would like to see retail incorporated like in the other options
Townhomes around the parking structure is stupid. Don't want townhomes there anyway, but they will have no view and have
4 level parking - too tall for that location
exposed parking garage and pedestrian bridge location (I like it farther south)
insufficient parking
Mixed use development is better suited on northern side of mineral. Feels disjointed
WAY TOO MUCH OFFICE SPACE. ./ Offices should not be allowed to border the park. Reserve nice space low middle income

This feels awkward. Number 9 is an orphan from the other retail. The town houses are adjacent to parking and retail.
Foot traffic to highline canal. Impact on neighborhood
too much office space
#7 rather see shops & retail, less open space than 3rd plan, less parking than 1st plan
Again neighborhood commerce analysis needs to dictate if more commerce can be supported
#6, #7 and #9 are horrible ideas. They only increase the terrible traffic congestion and increase air pollution and incr noise.
Hate to see a new #3. one bridge is enough, the construction will disrupt traffic on Santa Fe
Still dislike the addition of an additional walkover #3.
Same as in option 1--it makes no sense to jump from natural to urban terrain, imagining that the phrase "park buffer" has m
High density development, more traffic, not enough parking
Townhouses
Number7
Sacrificing parking and parks and open space for retail and office space.
Way too much parking, the pedestrian bridge is too far from the light rail station
Need more parking
The combination office/retail and residential space along the park buffer.
Parking garage is too big, not enough retail space. Think it would be better to swap locations of office space (7) & townhome
A 3 story building for offices seems like it would stand out in the area
lack of density and disconnection (activity and use, not trails) of southern parcels from Aspen grove.
less open space than #1, this is my least preferred option, not a lot of parking, not welcoming light rail space
Too congested, crowded as in Option 1
9 is uncenssary, still not enough replacemnt for the overflow parking you are losing
I think it may be a little too dense for the surrounding area, but I like the mix of office/residential
Less retail and larger parking structure for RTD lightrail
Don't build any tall buildings or heavy lighted structures near the park.
3#? Why a pedestrian bridge over into residential neighborhood. Parking garage Horrible! DISLIKE!!!
The pedestrian bridge is way too far north and inconvenient. Too much office, retail is poorly located
Pedi bridge goes into the neighborhood?
new ped bridge is not needed. Will not be used much at all.

Concerns about traffic congestion in an already cramped area.
#8
The new retail building #9 that is separate from other retail.
But west side of City Ditch needs to be added to S Suburban park
Ped bridge will bring in riff raf
Longer walk to parking, thru townhomes and shops. Concern about how much the extra shops and offices will make parking
The pedestrian bridge seems like it could increase inter neighborhood crime
Ped bridge (#3) is too far North; don't need more retail space;
If you think that less than 5 acres is considered "open space" you have moved here from California
Too many multifamily units at an already congested intersection.
Do not like the idea of 3 level parking structure.
#3 too far north!, too much housing, it will be super congested!

6. Do you have any other comments regarding Option #2?

Where does the East end of pedestrian bridge #3 terminate?

WHERE ARE THE BUS STATIONS

Your space for answers is inadequate!!!!

Doesn't seem as inviting as #1

Would prefer to see a pedestrain bridge over Mineral to serve #13

I like this better than #1.

Townhouses shield garage from view except along Santa Fe.

This would be nice to have more little shops and coffee houses

There is already a massive amount of existing residential in that area
do not build pedestrian bridge in back of my house.

how much parking? 795 or 485 per level?

Travellers coming in on train balances out travellers going out better.

dump it as an option

Apartment complexes are reducing the quality of life in Littleton.

No

Concerned about the height of the parking structures. Preserving mountain views for homes is vital. Alamo is pushing

Not liking this one because of the least parks and open space.

Can't you incorporate something along Mineral? Why slice through private homes??!!
Prefer Option A
The nature trails are fine as is, why is money being spent?
None
better than one. Still too high density and busy.
There must be options that do not include high-density development--we need more green space.
Get rid of adding more housing to thee mix!
Really like the additional open space park, trails & more
Need a bridge or walkway from #8 to #13.
Same comments about security as with scenario 1
no
Again increased traffic at Mineral & S Platte Pkwy
(for all options) need a better way for bikes to get across Sante Fe
don't know
Make this a lite rail transit hub
No townhomes, no office buildings. #9 retial is in a poor spot.
Why is a new pedestrian bridge and north Aspen Grove access needed?
Option 1 was better at connecting the various uses
Homes should not block access to Aspen Grove.

overall I like this one a little better than the others with the exception that it has less parking than plan#1
Somehow not as exciting
Don't like anything about this one either
This is a more practical use of space- less congested than other options.
Again, survey design prevents fully responding to the questions.
Slightly better than option 2. We have such a glut of apartments in the area.
The road and intersection will need to be widened with the increase in offices and residential
Less office space and more parking would make this a natural middle ground.
You need to address the Santa Fe mineral intersection before building anything. It is the #1 accident intersection
I like this option the least
Where would the new pedestrian bridge connect people to on the east side? Does that also go into the neighborhood
like pedestrian bridge #3 spaced further north vs. option 1
Who wants to live across the street from railroad - why is that never mentioned?
I like #1 better than this one. I really like the trail connections and connection of Aspen Grove.
If the RTD light rail can not be extended then maximize on retail near the parking to get tax dollars; opt A preferred
Additional devolve the near south platte park will extreme damaging.
Why does there need to be a 795/level parking garage! Expand and pave the lot out to the Carson Center with no gar
Makes better use of existing bridge connection - it connects to retail rather than right to garage
This option makes no sense to me.
Aspen grove can't keep retailers. Why add more retail?

A question, what impact fees will be assessed to developers to help cover the city services demand?
A lot of detail north of Mineral none south of Mineral
no ped bridge
How many levels on the structure?
Much better than 1
Need space on E side of Mineral/Santa Fe for passenger drop off area.
Option B for office space would be a better choice. The entire project is absurd and I would assume the developer is
the plan has a more urban feel than #1.
Does Littleton need all that office space? or retail? Englewood has a similiar situation and that has lots of vacancy.

7. What do you like about Option #3?
"maker" campus
NUMBER 4
River walk public open space
Nothing
Public plaza, riverwalk
Nothing
Public plaza spaces and park! Mix of multi-family and townhomes. Ground floor retail under parking structures
Riverwalk and parks
I like the idea of adding a city park/Plaza area.
Nothing.
Best option but could be better. Most open space, less obtrusive split garages without losing spaces.
Maker campus, plazas
new pedestrian bridge and trail connections
A little more open space planned
Nothing
The public plaza (9) seems to be more like Southglen. Not as much parking facing the houses on the other side of Sa
nothing
Nothing
Nothing
Mark parking
This one seems to have the most parking and the most visual appeal

Common areas and open space--need more of this!!!
Amount of open space, includes retail, general layout looks much nicer
#4 access to aspen grove
trail connections
River Walk and Public Plaza
Same things I like about one and two.. connections more access, park
#6 riverwalk
river walk idea
Pedestrian access to the shopping center
Nothing
Nothing
Plaza & Mixed use space
trails and ped. bridge
Overall improved access ability. I think the pedestrian bridge #3 should be moved to give access to both LR platform and office maker
My favorite option
That parking structures are split, public plaza, retail along the riverwalk street
Aspen Grove connectivity
access to the neighborhood
Love the option to have more multifamily units as the demand is often greater than the supply, also like the public plaza like City Ditch Open Space, #17
Townhomes and ground floor retail
Public areas near the bridge to light rail are nice I guess.
Lower residential density and office campus
all the trail connections and the split parking garage with the plaza
The seeming simplicity
Retail strip with 3 story residential adjacent would make a welcoming street
3 / 14 / 15 / 18 / 19

I love the way the uses have been integrated in this option. It might be my favorite.
Parking garage
the plaza
#10, the most open space of all the plans, #11, #6
Dad Clark underpass - northern overpass
I like two parking structures, incorporating ground floor retail with parking and public plaza
Nothing- this is the worst of the 3 options.
Here also, it retains the ag land, open space and vistas to the river south of Mineral unobstructed.
Open space
5 and 8
Maximizes public and open space with creative multi-area layout.
Open plaza instead of a huge parking structure, that's awesome
Nothing
The public plaza
Residential options near river/open space, 2 separate parking garages with ground floor retail, inclusion plazas
I like this plan the best. Open spaces inside a developed area.
like level of density and focused activity/formal open space at mineral and the place it creates.
pedestrian access to aspen grove, 2nd bridge the public plaza is a welcoming gateway to littleotn
Nothing
Nothing
I like that it is mixed use development. I like the trail connections and the parks and open space.
Open plaza; larger retail (tax dollars) and larger amount of office space
Nothing
18, 15, 14
Design/connectivity is best of 3 options; strong connection from station to plaza/Aspen Grove
The Riverwalk is a nice concept
Like the plaza idea and two different parking sites. Like the park.

In comparison to the previous options, nothing.
Public Plaza; pedestrian access
City ditch not piped, multiple use for parking structures (retail plus parking)
#9 & # 10
Nothing
Nothing positive
Public Plaza could be great. improved trails. Ped bridge
none
Plaza.
Neighborhood park
Not a lot
more open space, but clearly packaged together with more parking and the most office space
nothing
Better then 2 or 1.
the public spaces

8. What do you not like about Option #3?
Fewer parking spaces than Option #1
HAVING TWO PARKING STURCTURES
All the multi family homes
Everything
Maybe not enough parking
Seriously, do you folks use this station. We don't need business or townhomes. We need parking that is accessible from
Second pedestrian bridge over Santa Fe seems unnecessary.
Not sure if that would be enough parking due to light rail traffic and new retail tradic
Too much multi family/condensed housing.
Not enough parking spaces.
Not nearly enough commuter parking; public plaza is a waste of land and places to loiter not optimal.
Still a 4-level garage fronting Mineral, WAY too many apartments(!).
Once again, a lot of office space.
multi family housing
Too dense - too much residential -
DO NOT BUILD PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE BEHIND MY HOUSE
Too many high density units; Too little light rail parking; Too densely packed
public plaza
Again, 16 is vague as to what is planned.
nothing
#5, #8, #9, #16
Less parking vs. other plans
Same as 1 and 2
Looks busy and complicated, 2 4 story buildings right on Santa Fe will block open space feeling of the neighborhood

Again, the impact on the neighborhoods....
Amount of multi-family units, prefer townhomes
nothing! this plan is awful, way too much shoe horned in!!
two different parking structures
nothing
Still to much high density, office etc. right along park border.
#7 parking is far from light rail
smaller parking structure, seems to have more dense concentration of residential/commercial/office units
Everything--especially the multi-family and townhome options. We need single-family ranch style homes.
High Density Housing
Lack of parking
#5 (High Density residential); #8 - more townhomes;
Access to LR platform from pedestrian bridge requires crossing to parking then across existing bridge again
too fragmented
Not as much parking the other 2 options
new pedestrian bridge in inconvenient place
Not enough parking, office/maker campus
Not enough parking.
not enough parking
Lack of parking (huge problem at Mineral Station already)
we do not need more rental properties in Littleton, especially backing up to South Platte Park
Ped bridge is distant from light rail; retail is distant from park and residential cuts off park
Will it be enough parking?
Quit with the townhomes and office space.
Wrapping residential around parking is not attractive; 4 level structure too tall for this location
not enough parking
Plaza in the middle of office doesnt seem inviting to public
High income properties should not dominate this beautiful area. Polo Reserve already exists.

The retail feels a little orphaned and may not work.
multiple parking structures
#5 & #8 this plan has the most housing, this plan has less parking than 1st plan
Commerce. Limited housing.
#5, 7, 8, 9 are horrible ideas. Adds traffic congestion, air, water and noise pollution
New pedestrian bridge...
The Plaza #10 is a complete waste of space. I strongly dislike the 2 4- level parking structures.
Again, it makes no sense to build multi-story town homes right next to the park--where is the in-character transitional dvp
High density development, not enough parking, increased congestion
242 apartments is way too many!!!
#12 and 10
Excessive multi-family housing and insufficient parking.
I'd like to see the second pedestrian bridge closer to the light rail station, still too much parking..
Need more parking like over on i25 near Lincoln. A big parking structure. I can't use the light rail because there is no pa
The split parking garages. I like one better.
Steep reduction in RTD parking unless the structure will be huge and be an eyesore for the development
parking garage 11 at mineral ave. the 'gateway' is pedestrian focused and doesn't address the car entry as well
need more parking, maybe underground?
1 and 2 are better options for parking
Again, it may be a little too dense for the surrounding area.
cut up nature of parking structure (north will be less utilized) and therefore, retail suffer; high density apartments; lg open
Don't build next to south platte park. It will ruin the lives of animals
17,16 (Horrible) Keep our open spaces and mountain views!
Total parking spaces vs. uses could be an issue
I don't like the split parking garage, the bridge is too far north, and there is too much office.
Don't agree with residential. Traffic concerns.
New ped bridge is not needed. It will not be used.

Limited parking, increased residential and less retail / commercial for tax income.
Parking seems limited
Another pedestrian crossing over Santa Fe seems an expensive option, although would be nice
Two exposed parking structure
Parking is too broken up, seems choppy and not user friendly.
What a cluster in that small area north of Minerals - No parking to speak of for our commuters (Aspen Grove shoppers at
not enough parking and ped bridge
Not enough parking. Long walk from bridge to parking.
Housing much too dense. More tow home less multi family
Development density is too high for this area, don't like building heights, additional traffic through Mineral/Santa Fe
You have packaged the plans so that all force people to take more bad then good.
way too many multifamily units.
#3 is too north, #3 should connect closer to the light rail

9. Do you have any other comments regarding Option #3?

WHERE ARE BUS STATIONS

Your answer space is cutting off my responses.

Later. Arrive after 7am and good luck parking. Options don't solve issues

Would prefer a bridge over Mineral to serve #16

Traffic during rush hour will be even worse! Have you driven over there lately during peak hours!?!

I like the layout of this the best but don't think there is enough parking.

Lack of commuter parking, public plaza & retail will make this plan utterly inept in a short period of time.

Replace apartments with townhouses.

the plazas are a GREAT idea

DO NOT BUILD PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE BEHIND MY HOUSE

dont like this plan

put back ped bridge 9 in opt1; remove 17 to west along park & make cutthru to 19 between where word "park" is, not at m

Apartment complexes are reducing the quality of life in Littleton.

Just focus on getting more parking please. There is no parking after 7:00 am.

Same as 1 and 2

Really for all three. Why are we only entertaining placing offices or housing above parking garages?

This is one of our last undeveloped areas--in a unique setting along the Platte and the Nature Ctr. This plan acknowledges
This is my favorite option
None of these plans are appropriate, save the money for something better
too many retail areas
Why retail or office with so much empty retail and office and Aspen Grove next door. Hope affordable housing included
Least desirable plan due to multiple residential/commercial/office developments
Stop adding housing to the mix!
Does not seem like enough parking. Not enough detail about Plaza space
Need bridge over mineral to get to #16.
Same security concerns as with other scenarios. Increased access increases security concerns. Would like to see security
no
Overflow of RTD patrons parking in Aspen Grove or residential spots concern me
not sure what multi-family means? apartments/condos? duplex? how high?
add ped bridge across Mineral Ave instead of a new one across SantaFe!
Parking structures may be very imposing?; absence of intersection flexibility
Just build a 2 story parking garage in the current dirt lot and have bridges over the street. Keep the 7-11.
Why is a new pedestrian bridge and north Aspen Grove access needed?
I can't really see the point of this design.
12 will encourage vagrants i.e. Englewood Station. WAY TOO MUCH office space.

I have difficulty not having these laid out in front of me. Harder to compare
Repeat comments from just above.
Maybe make an ampieheater for the public plaza?
Dislike the additional pedestrian bridge # 3. Does anyone remember "The Bridge to Nowhere" on Wadsworth at Bowles?
The 3 alternatives are too development intensive--they do not represent the true range of alternatives available.
This is the worst of 3 bad alternatives
Leave more open space. Not everything has to be developed.
Need another bridge. Widen roads
Probably the most attractive option to look at.
You need another option that really do yes on the problem, parking
I FOR SURE LIKE THIS OPTION THE BEST!!
can the parking lots at Aspen grove or parcels 16 be used for parking? It would create a longer pedestrian path and more
Who wants to live across the street from railroad? - why is that never mentioneed?
I still like Opetion #1 best.
high density multi family housing is NOT preferred. Prefer townhome
The 4 level parking garage is much more reasonable than the other options
This is the best design - provides boulevard entry into Aspen Grove and strong ped connections
I don't see this site as ideal for any office space. Transit, residential and retail only.
Favorite out of the 3

Again turn west side of City Ditch into open space / Park
I do like breaking up the garages for the plaza.
Do not need another ped bridge
What about bikes?
Still need passenger drop off area on the East side of Mineral Santa Fe.
Put the larger open space from 3 with no parking multi level parking and less homes. TADAH!!
the most urban plan yet. the emphasis should be the rural feel of the community, not jamming the maximum units into the
overall i think this is too high density for this lot of land
What about single family homes with yards?

10. Do you have any other feedback you'd like to share on this project?
Would be great if these changes would be finished in the next 3 years.
PARKING IS MY BIGGEST CONCERN
Do we really need more townhomes and multi family residences
#s 2 & 3 are awful; # 1 is ok But hoe are you proposing to manage the additional traffic? I guess you aren't.
Parking is the issue. Don't need townhomes or business here.
#3 is superior to the other two options by a wide margin.
Avoid over developing the area. The current open spaces are nice and traffic is already bad.
I think that no apartments/condos should be added. Townhouses or apartments above commercial. I like the idea of a comr
I often cannot take Light Rail because parking is always full. draft plan must stay focused on current & future parking demar
No need to cram in retail; there's plenty coming to the south. Mineral traffic is already a nightmare; fix before development.
Would be great to have more spots to hang out. Like plazas, coffee houses, etc.
Please try and keep the density down - residential and otherwise. There is too much traffic in the area as it is - it is an
DO NOT BUILD PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE BEHIND MY HOUSE
Why does this area need to be "redeveloped"? Other than not enough parking for the light rail, the area seems just fine as
Thank you for the easy way to comment on this project
Another reason I don't want to live in Littleton any longer.
the trails are most impt, the lightrail second. fill in with retail, but remember we want to walk in NATURE, not retail/cement
There is no parking available at Mineral or Littleton after 6:30 or 7:00 am. Do something about it. If trying to go downtown ir
As a 53 yr resident of Littleton, our view of the mountains and keeping as much open space is VERY IMPORTANT to the re
Plans are one thing but quality design and construction are most valued by me.

Be cognizant of the lasting impact this will have: will it attract people to Littleton or be the new concrete "umbrellas" ?
I want open space to always be maximized, I think the area is too small to add 100s of multi-family units
All these plans look terrible, they look like someone has play money to waste
none
Any high density housing here should range from moderate to affordable.
Of the 3 I prefer #1. I would love to see a public library in the area.
Please provide options that do not include high-density development. 85 is already very heavily trafficked.
These options are terrible. Quit trying to cram more people and traffic into this area!!
Parking should not be fee-based. It should be free. You're making this place too congested so I'd probably not go there.
I like the new pedestrian bridge. But I think it should be positioned so that it gives direct access to LR platform
no
Growth and development of this area is needed! Excited to see movement!
Just really hope to have a better way to get bikes across Sante Fe and really want it to feel like a neighborhood vs. retail
pedestrian bridges are expensive, I don't see the benefit of such an expensive upgrade
No
Possibly consider all multifamily units instead of multifamily units and townhomes
Need to contemplate possible intersection changes, at least ideally
There needs to be a parking structure and expansion of light rail in all directions. Seize the opportunity before its all develo
I didn't see much variation between options. SOMEONE really wants mixed use....read....development.
Just build a 2 story parking garage in the current dirt lot and have bridges over the street. Keep the 7-11. No townhomes
Looks exciting!
Don't over develop this beautiful area. Preserve the animal habitat. Aspen Grove is awful and always has empty retail.

Keep as many connections as possible. Push for as much density as possible. Plan for connections to the Ensor Property
no
I'm not really crazy about all of the plans. I wish there could be a better combo of parking, open spaces, retail & less housing
All commercial and residential development will severely increase traffic congestion and air & noise pollution. DON'T DO IT
More space for comments would have been nice.
PUMA needs to go back to the drawing board. At least alternative that is not intensely urban is needed--then one in-between
Any of these will make the problems worse
Go easy on the retail development. Aspen Grove already has so many vacancies. And not to mention how dead Southwest
The traffic at the intersection is already high.
Future development can focus on housing & retail (Aspen Grove sufficient). Parking is key to encouraging the use of the rail
I'd like to see a plan to make crossing Mineral on the east side of Santa Fe safer for pedestrians with the new trail connectic
How will this impact traffic. It is already a nightmare on mineral west of this area. How have you addressed traffic.
After looking at all three options, I prefer #1. It has the most parking spaces and I like the overall plan best.
I vote for option 3!
I would love for the park to have a splash park feature and a cool playground. What about expanding the intersection?
This project should help Aspen Grove be healthy for the next 50 years, not detract or not add significantly.
I like a mix of pedestrian, parking, housing and office
If additional retail is needed there are plenty of vancancies in Aspen Grove. Why does retail have to be related to the river?
This should be on public display at Aspoen Grove, or City Hall, or in several locations like Platte River Grill or Starbucks so
I really like that we are looking at the idea of mixed use development and a wrapped parking structure.
DO NOT WANT HIGH DENSITY APARTMENTS; will have enough growth with south side of mineral. comment boxes shou
You have to stop all plans to build next to south platte park. The additional devolopment bed eve stating to the ecosystem.
Absolutely insane that the City of Littleton would consider any BIG Chains on the corner of our open spaces with Mt Views.
It's far past time that these sites develop beyond a sea of surface parking!
Ranking: #1 is best, #2 is worst, #3 in the middle.
Concerns about future development on the southwest side of Santa fe. Traffic is major concern.
Yes. Parking is the greater need at a light rail station, not a new bridge and not additional housing.

Who pays for this- private developers?
Keeping access to the South Platt trail from this area is important to me.
City Council is hell bent on adding more apartments in Littleton - take this opportunity to add much more open space
Be strong against anti-growth people.
existing ped bridge is adequate
Plaza, extra parking, and bike friendly are more important than townhomes or offices. Plan 1 best for access to retail
Please preserve our way of life, views, and property values
Just think it is sad to see Littleton putting profit ahead of people. U should be ashamed.
We moved to this area to escape a city environment. Excessive development and overcrowding are also dominating this community
how will the additional traffic congestion to an already poor situation be addressed?
These are not options, it is just the same things rearranged. Seems like a predetermined outcome with the pretense of choice

nunity Pla
nds.

is.

1
sidents

south.

g

!!

n.

Plaza is.

lway
on

ld be larger

community.

ce.

Mineral Light Rail STAMP Community Engagement

August 22, 2016

**Open House and Study Session
and online comment forms**

Date Recorded: August 10, 2016

1. These three "choices" are no choice at all because they are all HIGH DENSITY DEVELOPMENT. There are not other choices, such as NO high density development.
2. These "choices" are awful. Other than needing additional light rail parking, why does this area need to be "redeveloped"? We definitely do not need new high density development in that area. That area is congested enough as it is. We also don't need a pedestrian access bridge to Aspen Grove? The current bridge is sufficient.
3. Thank you for the opportunity for input. I am in favor of #1 with a slight modification. It's easier to show what I mean in a picture (attached). Walking along Mineral or a mixed use area is not ideal. Crossing over Mineral, a very busy street to go south is not good. I think attached explains what is a better design (red if preferred trail; lose the proposed trail that is marked out with black x). Great pedestrian bridge #9 added to increase walkers, bikers to the light rail from east of Santa Fe - good addition.
4. Does anybody know how many parking spots are currently at the Mineral Station? I assume all three options will require paid parking for light rail? Where did the bus stops go? My concern is that convenient transportation to downtown is one of the big factors that makes Littleton so vibrant and these plans do not take commuters / public transportation into consideration outside of trail access. As to timing, the final plan is slated to be approved by the end of September, so an "alternative" that doesn't include high density development may be a tough sell at this point. There is an open house on 8/22.
5. Paid parking on top of the already high price for the light rail. What a way to "encourage" use of public transportation.

And did they ever previously give anyone the chance to provide input as to alternatives that don't include high density development?

Anyone know why this area is being "redeveloped" (other than big money, of course).

6. I prefer #1 also. I like idea of the trail (15,16) underneath Santa Fe although I would hope there would be a good reason to even HAVE the trail. What are we walking to that we can't get to by going over the existing bridge? If it's just stores, then majority of people will be driving/parking so might not be worth the cost of doing at all. We can get to Mary Carter trail now via the existing bridge. I would prefer residential and more open park areas closer to the trail as long as it's open for access to the public. What about a nice park to hang out in around there as well? and then the majority office/retail on the south side of mineral. Small family owned retail and NO BIG CHAINS like Walmart!. Perhaps a building code so they look unique and inviting, perhaps similar to downtown Littleton look. I don't think building a 2nd pedestrian bridge across Santa Fe is necessary. Spend money elsewhere. The Trail (10) would be nice to allow jackass hill residence better

walking to the existing bridge as they do it now, it's just not paved. But they don't need an extra bridge just for themselves. Having lived at Southpark townhomes, I also think a pedestrian bridge across mineral would be great addition. Traffic at that intersection is dangerous for pedestrian as people always trying to run the light.

Perhaps extend the existing bridge across mineral along the light rail and then stairs down to the south sidewalk. Stoplight timings should also be looked into, OR look into building an overpass so there is no light at Santa Fe. That would help alleviate backups all directions.

There is NOT enough space in the survey to enter long comments so you can't really speak to what you want to say very well. These comment boxes should be expanded.

I like [another commenter's] idea of moving the trail away from Mineral and moving it further south to go into the new retail area.

7. Thank you [City Staff] for sharing here and providing the link to officially provide input on the plan. It's hopeful that Littleton could follow suit of other "mixed use" space such as Southglenn or The Landmark where parking is free and tenant parking is separate from retail and dining guests.

I understand that the development of this space in SOME form is needed, in order to keep up with other developing areas such as Littleton Village and to help the struggling retail areas of Aspen Grove.

I am hopeful that an increase of office space will bring additional tax revenue and businesses to our area, but I am concerned about the high density residential plans. Of all the plans I like option 2A as it offers the most office space and least residential, as well as a good amount of parking, open space, trails, trail access & pedestrian walk ways.

Thank you for giving our community an opportunity to share our opinion.

8. I would first like to see a resolution to the parking problem that everyday commuters are asking for. If they build a parking garage that holds only 750 +/- on each level, a two level garage does not
9. Guess I really don't understand the need for additional bridges across Santa Fe. Isn't the one going to the light rail sufficient? Traffic in the area would become an even bigger nightmare than it currently is. What about the additional burden on such things as water, etc. We already suffer from shortages, high rates and now want to add even more people to the area. Then, how long before the same thing happens across Mineral and we are faced with the same proposals again.
10. There goes the neighborhood
11. Seems the best solution to the parking issues at Mineral would be to extend the line to Highlands Ranch Parkway and add parking there. I would bet 80 to 90 percent of the cars at Mineral come from Highlands Ranch.

12. Does any plan address existing traffic congestion and prepare for the additional impact of high density development?
13. [To comment #12], the City does not have a Comprehensive Traffic Plan.
14. RTD wants the developers of the high density developments to pay for the parking as they have no budget for it. Extending the line to highlands ranch would also help, but there is no budget for that right now either. We could try to learn from Englewood's transit oriented development around their light rail station, but instead we are given 3 awful development plans to choose among. RTD cares nothing about our concerns; they just want someone else to pay for the parking.
15. I find the survey presentation confusing. it needs more contextual information highlighting differences between the different options. Make it easier for me to comment: which things are the same and different between the choices.
16. I think I speak for a lot of Littleton residents when I say I'm disappointed and saddened by any future development in this area. Long time Littleton residents love living here for its old town feel, sense of community and open space. Do we really need ANOTHER shopping mall? Why destroy this nicest part of Santa Fe? Why bring in more traffic, people, and noise? I love living here and love raising my kiddos here too. Plant some trees, grow more grass, and make a park for us to enjoy. I know the almighty, selfish dollar will prevail but I'm just saying...Old Littleton is dying 😞
17. Amen!
18. I agree with you.
19. Only 128 characters permitted per response on the survey? Seems a little inadequate...looks fascinating though, excited to see the area evolve! Will the condos and townhomes be affordable for current residents who want to downsize? What will be the price point?
20. S. Platte River Parkway, the little street just west of Santa Fe that goes to the RTD parking, Aspen Grove, the Nature Center, the apartments and the Wolhurst Landing townhomes, absolutely cannot handle more traffic. And more homes and offices would mean more traffic. Making left turns onto this little road, and left turns from it onto Mineral are sometimes impossible and dangerous at best and pedestrians put their lives at risk crossing this road now. Furthermore more traffic in this area means more air, water, light and noise pollution. You will only be sickening and killing the nearby wildlife and park vegetation, too. This area is fragile. Please treat it gently.
21. I like option 1 the best. I also have concerns about the high density in the area due to the lack of ability of roads to handle the traffic that is already a big problem a good portion of the day on Mineral heading either direction to Santa Fe and Santa Fe in general. I would like to see more open space and parks in the area. What is happening about extending the line to High Lands Ranch? A lot of the parking is from people coming in from the south. It would also be great if RTD could get the people in central and southern Douglas County to

pay the RTD tax to extend bus service further south. I know they have tried in the past and failed, but the demographics are so much different than they were 20 years ago.

22. I agree with [another commenter]. There apparently was no consideration of the effect that building 630 homes and a large amount of commercial space at Littleton Village (Broadway and Dry Creek) would have on the people who have to use Broadway every day. Only a few houses are occupied now, and much of the time traffic is very congested. I hate to think of what it will be like when it's built out. There is a dangerous northbound traffic signal at that intersection and the southbound traffic lanes leading to that intersection are confusing. The patch job in the southbound lanes looks like and feels like it was done by amateurs. I contacted City Council member Peggy Cole, who has shared this concern with the City Council, and they will replace the traffic signal, hopefully soon. From other comments I've read, the need for a different traffic light was overlooked in the planning stages, and now the city rather than the developer has to pay for it. Someone mentioned the safety improvements would cost \$182,000. Development is running rampant, and it definitely favors the developers over the residents of Littleton. I just don't understand how this is happening, when it so majorly affects our quality of life. It's sad and I hope that out-of-control and irresponsible development can be stopped.
23. The traffic situation on Mineral is already bad and the city is doing nothing about it. Oh, yes, they did put a sign for Long Ave saying no through traffic, as if anyone cutting through pays any attention to it or any enforcement by the city. I've seen the traffic backed up to the swimming pool on Long Ave. Coming down from Jackass Hill to cross Mineral in the afternoon is a crap shoot. The intersection is often blocked, either by traffic proceeding west on Mineral thinking they have to make the light and blocking the intersection, traffic turning right onto Mineral from J A Hill, or traffic wanting to turn left onto Mineral, and the through traffic crossing Mineral from Long Ave up JA Hill. A total mess from 4-6, but the city is concerned more about speeding and puts speed traps along Prince. Unless the city is prepared to address and solve the PRESENT problems, this reader has no faith that additional development will make the situation any better. There's more to a community than property taxes for city coffers.

Date Recorded: August 17, 2016

I have been to two meetings on this issue and neither RTD nor CDOT representatives have been in attendance. Since this project relates to them, could we please have them in attendance to discuss the impact of the plan on their future development etc. This project is very important to our community and a hasty decision might not be best for everyone. In the last meeting, October was mentioned as the date that a final decision COULD not would be made. I will be there on August 22.

Date Recorded: August 18, 2016

1. I am a resident of Southpark at the intersection of Mineral and Santa Fe. The congestion of traffic at Mineral and Santa Fe has caused a traffic overflow into our neighborhood at evening rush hour that is dangerous, noisy and detrimental to our neighborhood. I have contacted the city in writing and via phone and our homeowners association has also worked with city to try and alleviate this concern. At present none of the methods of controlling this traffic has had any impact. With additional development at the light rail station and along Santa Fe, as residents and longtime Littleton tax payers, we have to have some kind of control put in place to keep traffic out of our neighborhood. I live on Bemis Street and have, on numerous occasions, been unable to actually turn left onto Long Drive off of my street at rush hour. If the city insists on overbuilding the Santa Fe/Mineral intersection, you will be damaging our quality of life and property values. There seems to be little or no concern (beyond building your tax base) about current and longtime residents in this area. The light rail station is a great asset to our area but there is not adequate parking and that has also caused problems in our neighborhood. Although I guess progress is seen as building more and making more money for the city, you are reducing the value and quality of our lives. Please reconsider the high density growth you are chasing and please help our neighborhood dog walkers, children coming to and from our pool and our residents who try to get out of their streets and fix the traffic problem you already have before you add more problems by building more homes and commercial property. My husband and I have been Littleton Residents for 30+ years. We love it here but soon that won't be the case. The noise, traffic, crime and congestion caused by overzealous and poorly planned building will ruin our experience here and our neighborhood.

Date Recorded: August 19, 2016

1. I will be out of town Mon to Wed and not able to attend the open house. I did attend the previous open house and provided by input. I will repeat that here.

The Master Plan should be looking at near term, mid-term and long term issues.

The biggest issues at present are the lack of parking during the week. All of the lots are full by 7:00a.m. M – Th and by 7:30 on most Fridays. The proposed alternatives do not add a significant amount of parking, and during construction of a parking garage in the same area as the main parking lot, the parking will be severely impacted.

There is an easy solution to this. The area to the east of Santa Fe and north of Mineral is undeveloped. The area is relatively flat and at least 5 acres at 120 spaces/acre this area would accommodate 600 spaces. If this was developed as a gravel surfaced lot, like the

west side of the current parking, it would be done with a minimum amount of earthwork and materials. The entry would be off of Jackass Hill and Mineral Ave. the egress would be onto Jackass Hill Rd or from the existing railroad access and on to Sunset Road.



For people living east of Jackass Hill this solution would save at least 10 minutes each trip as it would avoid having to navigate the Jackass Hill Road/Mineral Intersection and the Mineral/Santa Fe intersection.

At the last open house I discussed this alternative with several of the residents, and marked it up on several of the plots that were left on the table, and presented a printout of the concept to the City Planner and to the PUMA representatives. There was significant support from residents. The issue of blocking the view from people along Dry Creek is a false issue, as the homes sit high and the parking lot would not block views. Increase traffic could result, but that is a result of the general population growth and can't be avoided.

I will be following this process to see if this idea is addressed as a way of gauging the sincerity of the City and its consultants in listening to residents. I plan to discuss with Your Hub an article about the general use of the station and the issues related to the parking, with a positive view of improvements.

Good luck with the meeting on Monday, I would like to suggest that the City make an

introduction this time to set the stage for PUMA speakers. Hopefully that will reduce the negative comments that were given by some of the community who had an opinion that the consultants were representing developers that were colluding with the City in order to build a development that would benefit private entities more than the public. The premise that the City cannot control the type of development at this site unless they have a Master Plan along the lines of what was presented is not well understood and the City should explain that better, if they can.

Looking forward to hearing from you and seeing what the outcome of this process will be.

Date Recorded: August 20, 2016

1. Dear Mr. Barons,

I do not understand why a completely new neighborhood needs to be built in the busiest area of Littleton when the issue is we need more parking spaces for the Light Rail Station NOT more apartments.

Putting in a neighborhood is only going to make things worse with congestion and traffic for those of us who already live here and don't want high density.

We live in Littleton for a reason – the small town atmosphere. If people want to live in high density apartments – let them move somewhere that wants it – THIS IS NOT LITTLETON. Just because we have a Light Rail Station is not a reason to build high density around it because EVERYONE ELSE DOES. We need to be unique and not follow the herds because Littleton is unique and that is why I chose to live here and this is why other businesses chose to come here – because it is unique – when will City Staff get this???

I've been to these meetings and there are NO other options than high density – that is crazy. I asked how many parking spaces this was going to add and was told 300. I do not believe that will be enough to solve any parking problem what so ever. And btw – studies have shown that people that live in Light Rail apartments still have cars and drive as much as any other person.

Let RTD give their speech in another community and leave Littleton alone. It is not our responsibility to fund RTD anymore than we already have.

Remember – we need more parking spaces not more apartments.

Date Recorded: August 22, 2016

1. Thank you for considering these comments recommending a day care on the area that is now a dirt parking lot.

South Platte Park is a treasure that the city would be wise to protect and expand. It should really be on the national registry of historic places for our city's foresight to provide a natural retreat that enriches a large area and the legislation that it provided for others. People are increasingly understanding the mental health benefits of undisturbed land. Please see <https://www.asla.org/healthbenefitsofnature.aspx>, research gathered by landscape architects. Our city had vision.

We should do something that builds on the legacy of valuing a natural retreat above building to the edge.

If development is required, I believe the best development use is a daycare that focuses on nature connection. This extends the vision not just through more acreage, but through time. We can teach future generations to love and care for natural places.

Nature connection programs for kids offer outdoor fun and learning, but they can focus on awareness and stewardship rather than adventure. Nature connection mentors can tell stories of kids diagnosed with ADD focusing for long periods of time, kids with learning gone wild, and kids with joy. The work of Richard Louv, author of *Last Child in the Woods*, and Jon Young, author of *Coyote Mentoring*, explain the value of nature for children and the best teaching methods well. Time in nature activates ancient, neural networks that bring out the best in people.

Such a program will gain national attention. It will create good students for LPS and good citizens for our city.

We could also add facilities for corporate retreats seeking nature connection. Colorado is all about the outdoors. That is why people come here, but downtown visitors can't get to much without a car. Littleton could work with the Denver Convention Center to give Colorado visitors a lightrail trip to the great Colorado Outdoors. The income could be significant, but we must be careful to not overstress the park.

Significantly, these activities leave the area quiet at night, and that is good for wildlife. I would encourage building a large parking structure by the lightrail without further

development in that area.

I have been writing about education for more than 30 years. Please let me know if I can provide additional information that would be helpful.

2. Myself and family are opposed to this development to the Mineral Light rail station. It will create unnecessary traffic and invitation to an already congested LR station. Multi level buildings will be obstructive and degrading to the residential neighbors surrounding the area.

We would rather see expanded single level parking built to the West if necessary.

3. Any changes or construction on the Mineral-Santa Fe intersection needs to reflect consideration for vehicular access to the Right Stop Inc. (an equestrian therapy program for children with disabilities). While there is an access road connected to Santa Fe, it can't be used as an entrance. The only entrance is a dirt road off Mineral immediately East of the tracks in that intersection. It is used daily by many and can not afford any access complications as it is already difficult to turn into.

serious consideration into the building plans against South Platte Parks border to reduce traffic, noise/light pollution for the park and its ecosystem.

Keep easy access for homes behind Aspen Grove during any construction.

North/South crosswalk on East side of intersection.

4. Design for parking only!!

Add park & ride south of mineral with shuttle bus connections to the station.

Do not add shopping into any parking structure.

5. Please scrap this plan until we've completed a comprehensive traffic plan and shared facts with citizens. This will be a death knoll for the Littleton we know and love. This will make us 16th Street Mall, Aurora, Lakewood, and every other place I've never wanted to live. I resent that this was all planned behind closed doors.
6. Isn't it time for the overflow parking area to be paved?

7. Since it appears that the development of the Mineral Station area is inevitable, then I suppose I would choose to go with the 1st option. The development is less dense than the other two plans, so is the less onerous choice.

Please choose architecture for all of the buildings that is not cheesy. Don't copy the cracker box construction of the apartments of Rio Grande. Those are an eyesore, and will become even more so as the buildings age.

Traffic is already a nightmare in this area. Going south on Santa Fe in the afternoon is a challenge. The intersection at Mineral and Jack Ass Hill Rd is dangerous in the morning and in the evening. Hopefully, in your "far-sighted and well-planned" vision to develop every square inch of open land in Littleton, you have also planned to build in the infrastructure to support this high-density development.

8. I was very disappointed in your PUMA Study Session tonight in the way PUMA acted liked there was a "certain group of people" that were not in favor of any of the plans. I as a citizen of Littleton and have the right to attend any meeting and give my opinion when it is asked for – because PUMA doesn't like my opinion doesn't mean that I am wrong and they are right. There were many people at the meeting I attended in July that were speaking up without raising there hands and blurting out questions because PUMA said they would allow questions and than didn't. there were questions that the entire group wanted to hear and get an answer to and PUMA pushed back from answering them so some people got unruly. I do want to point out that NONE of these people were "the usual suspects" as we have been called. They were all citizen that were put out by PUMA not allowing them to ask questions when they said they would at the beginning of the meeting. I thought it was very unprofessional for PUMA tonight to refer to a "group of people" in a derogatory manner which makes it look like they were coached by someone at the City. We the citizens of Littleton have the right to give our opinions on things that are forming and shaping our precious city. We speak because we care.
9. Extend the light rail further South on Santa Fe to Sterling Development, Lucent, etc. either by light rail or busing. Less high density near park.
10. Protect the panoramic view from the light rail platform.
11. PUMA's 3 identified options to all focus on urban development – and conversations with staff here tonight suggest that they view "do nothing" as the only other alternative. But this is not true. As others have observed – there are many other suburban alternatives which better fit the character of affected neighborhoods, citizen desires, and the logistical

constraints of parking and traffic. Why are these not being addressed?

12. Greenway – Open Space – Connections

- a. Change ways of thinking to make Denver/Littleton a truly multi-modal transportation network. 1st thing: keep trails open past dusk for commuters.

13. Traffic! Without fixing Mineral/Santa Fe first will make the traffic nightmare even worse. Littleton is not Denver! We are a suburb not an urban city. We want to keep our small town character, so development must fit in with that.

14. These design options will obliterate the river view. The river should be highlighted not hidden behind urban development.

15. Acknowledging the existing traffic/parking issues, this site should be developed with more active uses. Having a light rail stop is basically a “more density here” sign. The plans look great!

16. Before the “more density here train leaves the station, planners and city council/administrators must identify the positive and negative consequences to both residents and visitors – commuters. These go well behind short-term economic business / visitor benefits.

17. Instead of high density residential next to park – put nature based/environmental day care in RTD overflow lot - !!!PROTECT PARK!!! Fragile – Protect Natural Areas.

- a. Comment reacting to this saying “Yea!”

18. Build a day care that offers nature connection. You honor the vision of a park and create good citizens and students. Parking facility in existing lot. For more income, offer corporate nature connection for convention attendees.

19. Mixed use, transit-oriented development is needed here – create streets lively with activity, improve connections between light rail neighborhoods and Aspen Grove.

20. Favor pedestrians and bikes – make pathways bike accessible for both bikes and wheeled/ADA access.

21. LINK area south of mineral (hopefully mixed use/residential) to the light rail station with a pedestrian bridge right to the station.

22. Proposed streetscape designs are GREAT! With tree lawns and bike lanes, retail between parking structures and the station (unlike Englewood station).
23. Improve access to pathways on east side of Santa Fe – lots of folks walk on them from the neighborhoods.
24. Welcoming gateway.
25. Riverwalk or amphitheater for community gatherings.
26. Leave the river natural!
27. Community Character as defined and practiced by the Kendig & Keast collaborative addresses both:
 - a. What: relative percent of Green Biomass, Brown Architectural mass/volume, and Grey 2-dimensional streets, parking, etc.
 - i. There is a continuum of [community character] ranging from Natural (mostly green) to Urban Core (mostly brown).
 - ii. 8 [community character] classes have been objectively defined.
 - iii. The city must decide on “WHAT” before planning the “HOW” now represented by PUMA’s 3 options.
 - b. Why: the desired end results to be achieved and negative outcomes to be avoided.
 - i. These are largely dependent on the selected community character type to be provided/maintained.
 - ii. So planners must relate WHAT to WHY.
 - c. How: what character should be here? The WHAT and WHY that best respond to and optimizes residents’ desires and preferences.
 - i. This place cannot be all things to all people, so choices must be made. ☺
28. Best scenario: keep as much open space as possible. Purchase open space if necessary. Come up with funding to extend the line down to C-470 and Lucent and put in the parking there.

Comment #1

I like the Development Option 3 especially: item numbers:

3. The new pedestrian bridge – I believe my family would use this bridge all the time instead of driving.

4. New pedestrian access to Aspen Grove

7. Parking structure – additionally parking is needed at Mineral Station.

14. Trail connection to Jackass Hill park and High Line Canal – I walk in this area to get to Light Rail and development of a trail is a wonderful idea. Also I believe some homeless people live in this area and it would be greatly appreciated if this area were cleaned up so it was more family friendly.

15. Trail connection and neighborhood open space. Please clean up the area and make it a park and remove the garbage in that is dumped in this area. It looks like homeless people made a camp there.

I support the new developments of Mineral Station because I would benefit from some of the options included. I shop at Mineral and use the Light Rail and value the changes

September 12, 2016

I would like to see the area east of Santa Fe and North of Mineral considered for parking for people coming from east of Santa Fe. Would take some addressing of drainage channel and some grading, but would take a huge load off of existing parking and relieve traffic as Jackass Hill and Mineral could access this area and not have to cross Santa Fe.