

**SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETING #2
AND LIST OF COMMENTS**

March 11, 2003

Contents

Section I: Overview of Public Open House/Meeting #2

Section II: Summary of Key Themes

Section III: Specific Comments

- Written Comments
- Comments Voiced to Individual Project Team Members
- Comments Voiced During the Presentation

Section IV: Meeting Attendees

SECTION I: OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE/MEETING

The open house was held from 6:30 pm to 8:30 pm on Tuesday, March 11, 2003 at the Central Christian Church located at 3690 Cherry Creek South Drive (in the project corridor). At 7:00 pm, a 30-minute formal presentation was provided by the project team to review the elements of the proposed design plans. Copies of the presentation are available by contacting Dennis Ohlrogge at 720-913-4546 or dennis.ohlrogge@ci.denver.co.us. Before and after the presentation, project team members were positioned at various stations around the room for attendees to provide their comments and to view plan elements shown in maps and graphics. The stations focused on various key topics and included the following:

- Station 1: Greeting and Sign-in Station
- Station 2: Corridor Concept Design
- Station 3: Trail and Urban Design Treatments
- Station 4: Alameda Intersection Evaluation
- Station 5: Steele Street Process
- Station 6: Public Involvement Activities/Opportunities for Input

Approximately 123 members of the general public attended the open house/presentation. The project team will ensure that all attendees that signed the sign-in sheet are included on the project mailing list to receive future newsletters and meeting announcements. A list of the attendees is included at the end of this summary.

Attendees expressed their comments either verbally during the Comment period or by completing a written comment form. A list of all comments made is provided in Section III of this summary. A summary of comments relating to common themes is provided in Section II.

The project team recognizes that there are still a couple of key elements that need to be refined and should be addressed in the coming months: parking in the vicinity of Cherry Creek Towers and the closure of Steele Street. The Steele Street closure is the topic of a separate study effort, and a committee has been formed to resolve this issue. For an update on this process, please call Pat Noyes of Pat Noyes & Associates at 303-440-8171 or pat@patnoyes.com.

Next Steps: This is the last formal public meeting held to discuss the proposed project plans. However, the project team will continue to hold meetings with individual homeowner associations and property owners regarding specific areas of concern throughout the next couple of months. Also, informational updates on the project will be posted on the City's web site under the Transportation Division page.

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF KEY THEMES

The following is a summary of the key themes in the comments voiced and written by meeting attendees in order of occurrence. Specific comments are listed in Section III.

Project Plans/Schedule

Many people were pleased with the proposed plan and praised the project team for their great efforts. Many are anxious to have the plans be implemented soon. Some suggest that all parties work together to improve the chances of implementing. Several are concerned about the limited availability of project funds.

Safety/Crossing Facilities

Many agreed with the pedestrian improvements of the south side sidewalk and the signal at Alameda. Several called for these elements to be implemented as soon as possible. Several attendees called for a signal at Steele though it is not warranted at this time. An increase in pedestrian activity at Steele Street may warrant additional signal lights with crossings in future.

Bicycle/Multi-use Trail

Many favored the plan with its proposal to enhance the Creek's northside trail to provide separate paths for pedestrians and bicyclists. One person suggested that the pedestrian portion of the multi-use trail be made wider. Another person favored spending more on preservation/pedestrian enhancements than on the University Blvd. entryway.

Parking

Parking for residents and visitors of residents is a major concern of many attendees especially in the area surrounding the Cherry Creek Towers. Suggestions included grandfathering the spaces at the Towers to having the Towers residents claim some responsibility to provide their own extra parking, to working out a compromise with the City. Other stated concerns included the impacts to surrounding neighborhoods if the existing parking is eliminated due to the proposed plan and the safety issue of elderly visitors having to walk greater distances to park. Most Cherry Creek Towers residents want to preserve existing parking, needed, they cite, for both residents and visitors in the area. One attendee suggested having parking separated from travel lanes to enhance safety.

Preservation of Creek & Natural Habitat

There was agreement that the Creek Corridor and surrounding habitat needs to be preserved. Many support the plan because it does not significantly infringe on the Creek habitat.

Traffic Lanes

Many support holding Cherry Creek South Drive to only two travel lanes. Others, however, questioned how only two lanes would accommodate mobility and the increasing number of trips being generated from either ends of the corridor. One attendee favored the provision of left turn lanes into neighborhood to the south. Others support the provision of left turn lanes onto northbound Colorado Blvd.

Reach 1 Design of *Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor*

Roundabout vs. Traffic Light at Alameda

Comments were again mixed regarding the roundabouts vs. traffic light issue at Alameda and Cherry Creek South Drive intersection. Some attendees favor roundabouts and their ability to reduce traffic congestion, while others recognize the easier pedestrian crossing and limited space requirements associated with a signal.

Medians

Several commented that they are against the idea of medians as they are expensive, take up space, and are difficult to maintain. Others see medians as providing a safe way for pedestrians to cross the road.

SECTION III: SPECIFIC COMMENTS

Written Comments

Form #1 (Mary Kiernan)

- Parking is the major issue in Cherry Creek North. It should be the primary focus of the plan.
- Taking scores of parking spaces from Cherry Creek Towers is irresponsible and is going to exacerbate an already existing parking problem on the south [side] of the Creek. This parking should be “grandfathered.”
- Medians are expensive, take space, and are difficult to maintain. Cut down on medians.

Form #2 (Cathy Caton Groene)

- Beautiful plans! Much needs to be done sooner [rather] than later.
- Median should be similar, perhaps, to that in the vicinity of University and Evans to avoid maintenance and loitering.
- Roundabout at South Cherry Creek is not a safe solution considering volume and ease/familiarity of use. Priority #1: Please consider [traffic] light at Alameda.
- Pedestrian crossing at Steele and another at Alameda seems [like] too many and a waste of money.

Form #3 (Susan Bishop)

- The City should require developers to provide parking for their residents. Cherry Creek Tower residents knew at the time they purchased their units that they only had one parking space [each].
- The plan is great. Appreciate the creative and hard work of the team.

Form #4 (Betty Ann Tichenor)

- Parallel or other parking on north side of Cherry Creek South Drive is counter productive to moving people and traffic and will produce more congestion. Master plan calls for 8-10 total spaces, not 49.
- This is not a residential street. It is a major arterial. Stop catering to only those with wealth or political clout and consider the people who need to use this arterial every day.
- Parking for Cherry Creek Towers is not the purview of this plan. The City should have required adequate parking when B-Corp bought the Towers and converted them into condos. The thousands of motorists who need to use this arterial should not be made to pay for the mistakes of the developer and City Planning and the few people [who will be] inconvenienced at Cherry Creek Towers.
- Do not reduce the number of lanes along Cherry Creek South Drive from Cherry Street to Holly.

Form #5 (Rita F. Renzi)

- Please address parking issues. If moving vans have to park on Cherry Creek South Drive, it is very dangerous. Presently, vans park in front of the Portico. People driving east cannot see around the van to see if a car is approaching. You have to inch out to see if you can get around the van. This is an accident waiting to happen. One of your concerns was safety, but vans parked on the street are a hazard.
- If Cherry Creek Towers loses parking (with present plan of right-of-way), more vans will also end up on the Drive.

Reach 1 Design of *Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor*

Form #6 (Triva Fulton)

- Thank you for all your hard work on this project. I think there are some great proposals and some exciting ideas.
- I would just like to make sure that there is a reasonable solution to the residential parking at Cherry Creek Towers. Many think this is a problem for Cherry Creek Towers only, but there are already parking problems in the surrounding neighborhood. Where is the parking going to go, and are people going to be expected to walk a great distance? There are many elderly people and single women. Would this be realistic or safe?

Form #7 (Jeff Miller)

- I really like the way you changed the bike path to make it safer for both the walkers and bikers. Changing the low water area to pedestrians will make it much better for them and running below the plaza for bikers will reduce potential conflicts.

Form #8 (Cathy Walsh)

- Beautiful plan – thank you.
- Hold fast on two lanes! There does seem to be a safety concern about parallel parking along the south side of Cherry Creek South Drive.
- Because money will be a problem, I would favor less spending on the University Blvd. “entry way” and more on the corridor preservation/pedestrian enhancements.

Form #9 (Patti Lovad)

- This was a great public meeting! Deb Perkins-Smith was outstanding in keeping a calm manner, acknowledging various opinions.
- Something that wasn't mentioned was if the parking area is reduced, exiting from the parking garage will be extremely dangerous because you will have to exit immediately from the garage into the traffic flow.

Form #10 (Luanne Hazelrigg)

- The City of Brest Park has many ball games that draw many people in cars. There should be adequate parking at the park to handle cars.
- This is a great plan with great care for the environment and people.
- Cherry Creek Tower residents have some responsibility to take care of their own parking problems.

Form #11 (R.B. Leather)

- Light at Alameda is the correct resolution
- The light can be flashing yellow on CCSD, turning red only on a pedestrian's activating the change. (It would be the same on Alameda.) Hence, there would be minimal “back up”, as cars have to stop for pedestrians in any case.
- Parking for residents is fully as important, or more so, as for recreational arrivals. It makes better sense to stage recreational arrivals in Reach 2, where space is abundant.
- Visitor parking is the issue. Community events and other small parties (10-25 cars) are frequent and essential for cultural fundraisers, political gatherings and merely social uses.
- The idea in “Our Community's Challenge” to divert traffic onto Alameda and then back onto Cherry Creek South Drive is badly thought through. It should be trashed. (It certainly looks like a Daniels Building grab of an esplanade on Cherry Creek!)

Reach 1 Design of *Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor*

Form #12 (Oswald and Gail Pfenninger)

- Great plan and presentation.
- Especially like left turn lanes into neighborhood to south from Drive and the bike path on north side of [Cherry] Creek dipping below current path next to shopping center.
- Landscaping and addition of left turns north on Colorado Blvd. are wonderful.
- Separation of pedestrians both from auto traffic and bicycle traffic is great planning. We both walk and bike on the path now, so [we] realize this is needed.
- Keep up the good work and make it happen within our lifetimes!

Form #13 (Joan Prugh)

- I was especially interested in a crosswalk across Cherry Creek Drive South that has a traffic light so that elderly people in wheelchairs or bicyclists can cross safely.
- Stopping at a median will not meet this need because traffic is almost constant at certain times of day.
- An Alameda light sounds ideal!
- I am happy you have decided to preserve Cherry Creek in as natural a state as possible.

Comments voiced to Project Team Members

- For the multi-use trail on north side of [Cherry] Creek, please make walking path wider. As it looks now, it's too narrow for two people to walk side by side.
- Don't hold up implementation of plan for parking issues.
- Cherry Creek Towers should take responsibility for providing their own parking. It is not the City of Denver's responsibility to provide. They knew what they were buying into.
- Would like a signal at Steele considered in the future if the pedestrian activity increases. Even though it may not be warranted now, once all the pedestrian improvements are implemented, more pedestrians will be attracted to corridor.
- Would still like roundabout considered as a means to reduce traffic congestion.
- [Prefer] roundabout – not a light at Alameda!
- Is there anything that we can do to change your mind about the roundabout?
- Will there be any way for me to cross CCSD without having to come up to Alameda? Will the right turn movements off of Alameda be stop or yield controlled so we can cross safely?
- Does Colorado have a law that pedestrians have the right of way in the crosswalk? How do I obtain a copy of this law and how do we enforce it? If we are not going to enforce it, then place signs along the road that state that you must stop when pedestrians in crosswalk.
- Removing the parking at Cherry Creek Towers is the worst idea. Removing this parking will lower our property values. Lower property values will affect the City's tax base, and I would think that the City would be concerned about that. It also will make service vehicles (plumbing, electrical, etc.) park blocks away from our building. Moving vans will now be parking along CCSD during loading and unloading.

Reach 1 Design of *Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor*

- One attendee provided city staff with a sketch on how to avoid widening CCSD and how to avoid taking the parking away from Cherry Creek Towers.
- Signal is great. Now I can cross with my kids instead of running for my life.
- It is great that the bicyclists won't be traveling on our street.
- I just don't see how this project is going to work if you take away the on street parking in front of the Citadel. I walked along CCSC twice today (10 am & 2 pm), and all of those spots were filled. How are you going to address this? What does the Citadel have in regards to parking?
- I agree with your matrix showing the evaluation of the Alameda intersection (signal vs. roundabout especially) completely.

Comments Voiced during Presentation

Responses from project team members are indicated in italics.

Comments from Cherry Creek Towers Residents

Speaker #1 (Mary Kiernan)

- Commend project team on showing design
- Agree with preserving creek and park-like quality of plan.
- Grey area is parking. Biggest issue in Cherry Creek area. Ignoring parking is irresponsible.
- Aerial shows parked cars. Eliminating all this parking will exacerbate the problem. Existing parking should be grandfathered.
- Medians can be collection place for debris [and] aren't the best use of space.

Speaker #2 (Triva Fulton)

- Areas marked for parking seem to be marked for visitors vs. residents. Need to address residential parking needs.

Speaker #3 (Jim Tomonto)

- Parking is critical for neighbors also, not just Cherry Creek Towers, such as the Enclave and the Citadel. The building was built in 1962 when parking wasn't as critical and used a 1 to 1 unit to parking ratio. Now, given existing parking ordinances, the ratio is 1 to 1.5, and so the building is ten spaces short under existing ordinances. The proposed plan identifies 42 spaces to be removed.
- How does project team propose to mitigate for these spaces? We propose to grandfather these 42 spaces under a separate plan.
- Elderly visitors of residents will have to park a block or more away from the building.
- We have signed letters from 76 Cherry Creek Towers residents stating the negative impacts of eliminating parking on the Towers and the surrounding neighborhood. We ask Councilman Brown to address this issue and to schedule a meeting with key neighborhood leaders to resolve.

Speaker #5 (Unidentified man, Cherry Creek Tower resident)

- Why are two pedestrian crossings provided at Alameda? *Thinks only pedestrian activity occurs at the Citadel and from Steele to areas to the south. A traffic signal is warranted under existing conditions at Alameda. The crossings are also for future generations, as connections to the east to City of Brest Park may be provided in the future. A signal at Steele may be warranted in the future.*

Speaker #13 (Bill McDonnell)

- Is use of lawns still to occur? *Native landscaping will be used, not turf.*
- What design elements are tools of compromise in the Towers vicinity? *First project team will have a discussion with City Management. The project team recognizes that more work needs to be done regarding this topic.*

Speaker #16 (Birch Musselman)

- Removing parking will negatively impact the property values of Cherry Creek Towers condos.
- When will the parking issue be resolved? *The project team has identified areas requiring more work to occur over the next month. Meetings will be scheduled with individual property owners and homeowner associations, such as the Cherry Creek Towers, to discuss specific areas of concern and topics.*

Reach 1 Design of *Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor*

Speaker #17 (Unidentified woman)

- Suggests designating representatives from key properties to participate on a committee for future meetings.

Speaker #18 (John Prior)

- Was a bridge for pedestrians considered? *Cost, aesthetics/right of way.*
- What about the roundabout idea? Thinks a traffic light at Alameda would increase the number of backed up cars. This traffic congestion would detract from the beauty of the corridor. Thinks roundabout would be a better alternative because it wouldn't contribute to idling car situation. *Based on comments made at first public meeting, a traffic signal at Alameda meets the priorities voiced by those people that have been involved throughout the project. A roundabout would be more difficult for pedestrians to cross and would require additional right of way.*

Speaker #19 (Unidentified man)

- Thinks cars parking along the north side of Cherry Creek South Drive would impact habitat. Also thinks a stoplight at Alameda would increase the number of cars backing up, which would also impact natural habitat.

Comments from Other Residents

Speaker #4 (Rich von Lührte, Hyde Park)

- Wants to suggest design is good, even though some issues are still to be resolved.
- We can only hope that it happens so we can eliminate mud, mess, and dangerous street.
- Landscaping good idea and the buffers to protect the Creek.
- When can it happen given the economy? Concerned that we are going to lose the quality of design during construction because of the limited funds available. We should send message to City to go forward with implementing the plans. *Currently the one project designated to occur in 2004 in this corridor is the provision of two turn lanes onto northbound Colorado Blvd. Additional requests may be approved in Autumn 2003 based on priorities established by community and City management.*

Speaker #6 (Joan Prugh, Stokes/Green Bowers Neighborhood)

- Thank you for listening to our concerns expressed at the last meeting and for including a pedestrian sidewalk on south side of Creek.
- Thinks the sidewalk on south side of street and the traffic light at Alameda should be implemented first.

Speaker #7 (Ann Callison, Reach 3)

- Hopes the project team has contacted the Corps of Engineers regarding changing the footprint of the floodplain.
- Mobility was part of Master Plan. Where is improving mobility in these plans? Seems to have been forgotten.
- Parallel parking should be barrier separated from the through traffic lanes to protect everyone.

Speaker #8 (Chuck Lind, City of Glendale)

- The City of Glendale is now working on the design of Reach 2. They want to change Cherry Creek South Drive in Reach 2 from 4 lanes to 2 lanes with a median to continue the greenway theme of reducing traffic and preserving the Creek habitat.
- Has following questions: How many lanes would fit in the cross-section of 49'9"? What is standard width of cross-section for Reach 1? What elements will be included in median? . *Only two lanes, one*

Reach 1 Design of *Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor*

for each direction, were considered, as set by the Master Plan. The cross-section varies up to 40 feet. Generally, low maintenance landscaping and xeriscaping is included in medians, though some medians will not be landscaped in pedestrian crossing areas.

Speaker #9 (Betty Ann Tichenor, Reach 2)

- Separation of paths by the mall into heels and wheels is good idea.
- Traffic keeps increasing to get people from southern areas to downtown. Thinks this plan will only serve to increase the time for those traveling through the Corridor.
- What traffic projections have the project team evaluated for the next team years?
- How will this proposed roadway accommodate increasing traffic on this arterial? *The project team evaluated 2025 traffic projections and confirmed that only two lanes are sufficient.*

Speaker #10 (Russ Carboy)

- Why aren't we putting a traffic light at Cherry Creek Towers? *Answered previously. See response to Speaker #5.*
- What are we going to do without our parking? Wants an answer and not to be put on back burner! *It has taken a year for the project team to develop plan and refine to this level of detail. Now the team can address mitigation.*

Speaker #11 (Not identified)

- Distributed a written proposal that attempts to appease all parties involved.
- Doesn't like tree-lined medians.
- Forget thoroughfare without medians.
- How is decision made to finance different elements?
- Use property more efficiently. Don't need to landscape.
- Intermittent stop light needed for traffic crossing Cherry Creek South Drive
- Parking in front of Citadel Building should be metered.

Speaker #12 (Walt Emery)

- Has lived in Corridor for 43 years.
- We should do as little as possible in regards to making improvements in the Corridor, so we won't encourage more people to come to the area. We'll be better off and can save our money.
- We don't need a median in the road, just an improved smooth road.

Speaker #14 (Sharon Elfenbein, The Enclave)

- We've been working on trying to improve this corridor for 6 years. Very anxious to make plans come to fruition.
- Medians will help people cross [the road]. Crosswalks will help. Curbside buffers will help.
- Want to encourage Cherry Creek Towers to work with project team to make plans work.
- Support pedestrian friendly elements of plan.

Speaker #15 (Carol Anderson, Polo Club Condos)

- Is Steele Street being left out?
- If you leave it out now, how will it ever be improved?

SECTION IV: Meeting Attendees

Corridor Residents

One Polo Creek, 2400 Cherry Creek So Dr.

Leslie Harms
Penny Leather
Richard Leather

Polo Club Condos - 3131 E Alameda

Dorothy Aaron
Carol Anderson
Polly Tasset
Alyce M. Hart
Larry Tepee
Paul Barru
Cathy Caton Groene
Selma Berman
Bernice Loperta

Cherry Creek Towers, 3100 Cherry Creek So Dr

William McDonnell
Marcia Rolander
Rita Renzi
Donna Hamilton
Bill Johnson
Dorothy Thompson
A.M. Paquette
M. Kathleen Turano
Jay Dowling
N. Hamlin
D. LiHan
Sara Behmoaras
Suzanne Blanchard
Lillian Blanchard Morton
Ellen Cohen/John Mayor
Mike Rice
Charles Gerarden
Ann Daxberger
Frank Ackerman
Tim Cook
Lorinda Tete
Jayme Hovland
Cecilia Ortega
Geri Trogu
Phyllis Stadler
Patti Lovaas
Rigsby Family
Linda Anderson

Judy Berry
Gigi Griefenberg
John Prior
Anthony Fierro
Mary Delaney
Donna McEncroe
Jim Tomonto
Jacques Barchilon
Ken Nolder
Jose Sanchez
Mary Kiernan
Dave Tank
Jeff Rudnick
Lisa Bobulinski
Ron Carboy
Nicole Stone
Gary and Maria Daniels
Triva Fulton
Janis S. Cummings
Michael and Kathleen Hennessy
Pat Barnes
Harry Segan
Birch Musselman (S. Ouray Cir.)

Hyde Park, 400 S Steele St.

JoAnn von Lührte
Rich von Lührte

Cherry Creek South Drive (misc addresses)

Bill and Sharon Elfenbein
Norm and Sandi Feldman
John Chatfield
Loren and Margaret Mall
Mari Gaylord
Pat McClean
Mark and Marilyn Kessler
Carol Lowenstern
Toshi Akiyama
Ed Lewin
Stanley Felix

Harrison Lane residents

Alan Gass

Reach 1 Design of *Cherry Creek South Drive Corridor*

Other Corridor Addresses

Walter Emery, on Cedar Ave
Joan Prugh, on Garfield
Cathy Walsh, on Cedar Ave
Tom and Madelyn Brogan, E. Alameda
James Mejia, S. Garfield
Gail and Oz Pfenninger, S. Garfield St.
Jill Livran, S. Garfield St.
Susan Bishop, E. Virginia Ave.
Evelyn McClean, Polo Club Place
Diane Barrett, Polo Club Drive
Mike O'Flaherty, E. Virginia Ave.
Luanne Hazelrigg, E. Cedar Ave.

Businesses

Carolyn Gray, The Citadel

Others

Denver Councilman Charlie Brown

Jonathan Ellis, Dahlia St.
Jeff Miller, Fairfax St.
Shelley Rice, E. Olive St.
J. A. Wilson, Polo Field Ln.
Kathleen A. Economos
Alan Eckman, Antero Ct (Golden)
Randy Wilson, Adams St.
Denis and Sandy Clanahan, Polo Field Ln.
Elizabeth Shaeffer, S. Cook St.
David Leaky, S. Corona St.
Fred Criswell, Gilpin St.
Steven Brase, S. Forest St.
C. Bonniwill, Williams St.
Rolf Kirby, W. Alice Pl.
Tim Dreese, Lafayette
Chuck Lind, E. Kentucky Ave.
Jannell Shaw
Bill Anschuetz, Steele St.
Anne Callison, Pontiac Way
Don Thompson
Betty Ann Tichenor, E Mexico Ave.
Charles Warner, E 4th Ave.

Project Team Members

City and County of Denver Staff

Dennis Ohlrogge, Public Works (Project Mgr)
Dick Gannon, Parks and Rec.
Debbie Kula, Development Engineering Services
James Mackay, Transportation Planning (IPP)
James Mejia, Parks & Rec
Ruth Murayama, Parks and Rec.
Roger Mutz, Public Works
Dennis Swain, Community Planning
Susan Walsh, Community Planning

Consultant Team

Gloria Botruff, Parsons Transportation
Matt Brown, Parson Transportation (Project Mgr)
Eric Osmundsen, Parsons Transportation
Jerry Shapins, Shapins Associates
Margaret Loperfido, Shapins Associates
Debra Perkins-Smith, David Evans and Associates, Inc.
Kristin Kenyon, David Evans and Associates, Inc.
Leah Mueller, David Evans and Associates, Inc.

P:\PTGI0000-0002\PUBLIC MTG #2\PublicMeeting2 Summary Final.doc