

Summary of Comments from June 28, 2011 Cherry Creek Focus Group Meeting

Note: Items highlighted in "Yellow" are those that identified as "Needs Further Discussion" after Focus Group 1. These topics were then discussed further during Focus Group Meetings #2 and #3.

Concept - General	Concept - Specific	Comments Summary	Action	Action Notes	FG Discussion	Focus Group
Alameda Parkway	Overall Concept	Much agreement with overall concept. Some requests for more information and details.	Needs further discussion.	Discussion Points: Impacts to property owners on N and S side. How the parkway works with "potential rail" Should we reconsider the planted medians Purpose for Garfield traffic signal and traffic impacts Alameda and CC Drive N intersection improvements Purpose and feasibility of fronting buildings onto Alameda	x	Urban Form and Public Realm
Areas of Change and Stability	Overall Concept	Several groups identified specific properties within proposed AOC that are high priorities for redevelopment.	Needs further discussion.	Discussion Points: What are high priority sites and what makes them high priority? What kind of change/reinvestment is desired? Why hasn't reinvestment taken place? What is needed to make reinvestment occur? What can the plan do?	x	Economic and Development Opportunities
Areas of Change and Stability	CCN Residential	One table identified CCN Residential as potential AOC, since many properties have yet to redevelop.	No Action	redevelopment and reinvestment still possible under AOS; new development will match existing character		
Areas of Change and Stability	6th Avenue	One table identified 6th Avenue - south side as AOC.	Staff review and response.	Determine through technical review if concept should be amended.		
Areas of Change and Stability	Harrison Street	Several groups thought Harrison AOC should be reconsidered in certain places (e.g. north of 1st Avenue, or on the west side of Harrison).	Staff review and response.	Determine through technical review if concept should be amended.		
Areas of Change and Stability	Shopping District	The north side of 1st Ave, mall structure and west side of University were all identified (by one table each) as potential AOS, with the thought being that these properties would likely not redevelop.	Staff review and response.	Need to be careful about pulling individual properties out of AOC, because then we are getting to a level of granularity not intended for AOC / AOS.		
Bicycle	1st and Steele Bike Routes	Many tables thought the shared use path on 1st and Steele should be reconsidered.	Needs further discussion.	Discussion Points: 1. The purpose is to make a safe and convenient connection between CC Trail and CCN. Bicyclists are already unsafely and illegally using 1st. Do we make 1st safe and legal to use or re-route them? 2. If we re-route them, where do they go? 3. If we accommodate them on 1st, what does that look like? 4. How to make 1st and University more bike friendly and intuitive?	x	Mobility, Connectivity, Infrastructure
Bicycle	Garfield Neighborhood Greenway	Garfield Neighborhood Greenway - overall strong agreement, although it received a red from one table because CCE wants the bike route on Madison	Needs further discussion.	Discussion Points: 1. Discuss goals for this North-South bicycle connection within the citywide and regional bicycle network as well as local network. 2. Discuss pros and cons of Garfield versus Madison toward achieving those goals, and any alternative routes or combinations of routes. 3. Discuss role of local streets in the bicycle network. 4. Could signage play a role in achieving all the goals (e.g bike route on Garfield with signage to "Village Center")? 5. Discuss role of traffic signals in bicycle and pedestrian safety, and the importance of traffic lights at Alameda and at CC Drive North for this greenway.	x	Mobility, Connectivity, Infrastructure
Bicycle	Clayton	Consider Clayton as a bike connection.	No Action	This has been discussed with Taubman already. Clayton is a private street. Taubman does not mind if bikes are on Clayton, but they do not want signage or an official route.		
Bicycle	6th and University	6th and University - better bike crossing and connect to Botanic Gardens if possible	Staff review and response.	Determine through technical review if concept should be amended.		
Bicycle	Alameda and Madison and CC Drive Intersection	High priority for bicycle improvements	Staff review and response.	Suggest improvements to make this intersection more bicycle friendly		
Bicycle	Bayaud Bike Lane	Bayaud bike lane - overall agreement; concern about Bayaud and Steele	Staff review and response.	Suggest improvements to Bayaud and Steele intersection to make it more bike and ped friendly. Also address what the intersection between bike lanes and a bike boulevard look like (e.g. Bayaud and Garfield)? Check where Bayaud bike lane goes east of Colorado		
Bicycle	CCN Business	CCN	Staff review and response.	Review Denver Moves for additional East-West connection through CCN Amend concept, if appropriate, after technical review.		
Bicycle	St. Paul	St. Paul bike route - replace with a Clayton bike route; Also, if St. Paul bike route remains, look at signage and crossing at 1st Avenue to clarify connections.	Staff review and response.	Determine through technical review if concept should be amended. Suggest improvements to St. Paul / 1st Intersection if St. Paul bike route stays.		
Bicycle	University - east side	East side of University - add bike connection	Staff review and response.	Determine through technical review if concept should be amended.		

Summary of Comments from June 28, 2011 Cherry Creek Focus Group Meeting

Note: Items highlighted in "Yellow" are those that identified as "Needs Further Discussion" after Focus Group 1. These topics were then discussed further during Focus Group Meetings #2 and #3.

Concept - General	Concept - Specific	Comments Summary	Action	Action Notes	FG Discussion	Focus Group
East 1st Avenue	Overall Concept	Mostly agreement. People want to know when this will be implemented. Also, they would rather see Phase 1 and 2 implemented at the same time. Several tables want to add a traffic signal within a few blocks of Steele. One table suggested planted medians in portions of the turn lane. Another table recommended continuing the design treatment to the 1st and Steele intersection.	Staff review and response.	Staff respond to the following: 1. Traffic signal 2. Planted medians 3. Implementation options		
Land Use Character Areas	Alameda Triangle Regional Center	Mostly agreement with a few requests for more information.	Needs further discussion.	Discuss Character and Scale with Focus Groups	x	Urban Form and Public Realm
Land Use Character Areas	CCE Regional Center	Some concern that Regional Center designation will push density east of Madison. Confusion why it would be Regional Center if there is so much residential	Needs further discussion.	Discuss Character and Scale with Focus Groups	x	Urban Form and Public Realm
Land Use Character Areas	CCE Urban Residential	Mostly agreement, but one table requested that we go with Urban Residential - Rowhouse to discourage more multi-family building form	Needs further discussion.	Discuss Character and Scale with Focus Groups	x	Urban Form and Public Realm
Land Use Character Areas	CCN Regional Center and 3rd Avenue Town Center	Very mixed reviews. Bottom line is that everyone wants to see the building heights transitions before being comfortable with the land use designations in CCN.	Needs further discussion.	Discuss Character and Scale with Focus Groups	x	Urban Form and Public Realm
Land Use Character Areas	Regional Center	Very mixed reviews. Bottom line is that everyone wants to see the building heights transitions before being comfortable with the land use designations in CCN.	Needs further discussion.	Discuss Character and Scale with Focus Groups	x	Urban Form and Public Realm
Land Use Character Areas	Town Center	Very mixed reviews. Bottom line is that everyone wants to see the building heights transitions before being comfortable with the land use designations in CCN.	Needs further discussion.	Discuss Character and Scale with Focus Groups	x	Urban Form and Public Realm
Land Use Character Areas	2nd Avenue, east of Steele	Check to see that commercial area matches existing commercial	Staff review and response.	Determine through technical review if concept should be amended.		
Land Use Character Areas	Bayaud and Madison	Several requests to change to Neighborhood Center	Staff review and response.	Determine through technical review if concept should be amended.		
Land Use Character Areas	CCN Urban Residential	Make sure follows G-MU-5 boundary	Staff review and response.	Determine through technical review if concept should be amended.		
Pedestrian	Pedestrian Priority Intersections - Garfield and Alameda	Remove ped priority intersection at Garfield and Alameda, because we do not want a traffic light here to implement this recommendation.	Needs further discussion.	See Garfield Neighborhood Greenway discussion.	x	Mobility, Connectivity, Infrastructure
Pedestrian	Pedestrian Priority Zone	Overall agreement with the concept and the boundaries; Enhancements are needed on Clayton on the mall property, in particular. How will PPZs in CCE and Alameda Triangle be implemented? Will standards be heightened within the PPZ, and how will the heightened standards be implemented	No Action	Details on Clayton will be worked out through west side development scenarios. Implementation will be discussed further along in the planning process.		
Pedestrian	Cherry Creek Trail	Consider a separated bike and ped trail, or some design to make the CCT safer for all users.	Staff review and response.	Separated bike/ped trail recommended in Greenway Master Plan. Implementation is pending funding.		
Pedestrian	Pedestrian Priority Intersections	Agreement on all existing ped priority intersections on 1st Avenue. Consider adding new ped priority for 1st Avenue intersections with Adams, Detroit, and Milwaukee. Add new ped priority intersections at 3rd and Josephine, 3rd and University, and 3rd and Colorado (primary access to Cranmer park); Add 2nd and University, Also add 6th and Colorado; consider if other Colorado intersections can be ped priority.	Staff review and response.	1. Determine through technical review if concept should be amended. 2. Identify standard characteristics for ped priority intersections 3. Develop concepts for 1-2 intersections.		
Pedestrian	University - east side, south of 1st	Add a sidewalk.	Staff review and response.	Determine through technical review if concept should be amended.		
Transit	7th Avenue	Error on map - this bus route should be on 8th	Amend concept.			
Transit	Bus Corridors and Enhanced Transit Corridors (all)	Strong agreement for all corridors. Need to discuss goals for improved bus service. Request for internal bus circulation such as a Cherry Creek Circulator.	Needs further discussion.	Discussion points: 1. Review existing bus service. 2. Goals for improving bus service.	x	Mobility, Connectivity, Infrastructure
Transit	Potential Rail Corridor	Very mixed reactions ranging from full support (4 tables) to "need more information", to a couple individuals being completely against. Service should both be neighborhood serving (frequent local stops) and connect to both Downtown and DIA. Not so concerned about connection to Aurora or SE Denver. Need to know how this route would connect with rest of the system. Consider other ways of addressing this concept in the plan without using the word "rail". Find a way to gauge the reaction from neighborhoods to the east and west.	Needs further discussion.	Discussion points: 1. Characteristics of existing mobility patterns and how that relates to rail. 2. DRCOG proposed connections to answer "how would this connect to the system?" 3. Characteristics that CC has identified, and how these might be achieved through "rail". 4. Potential modes and service types. 5. Realities and potential timeline for implementation. 6. Potential amendments to the Concept to be less "scary".	x	Mobility, Connectivity, Infrastructure and - Economic and Development Opportunities
Vehicle	Proposed New Signals (Alameda Triangle)	Very mixed reactions. Many people do not understand the purpose of these being proposed. Some are worried about traffic backing up due to new signals. CCE residents are concerned about cut-through traffic in their neighborhood if a new light is installed on Alameda. CCE residents do not want the light at Garfield because they do not think Garfield should be a bike and ped connection to Alameda Triangle.	Needs further discussion.	Discussion points: 1. Purpose for these signals. - Proposed design/concept at Dakota, Garfield and CC Drive North 2. Is the original purpose for the signals still valid (e.g. pedestrian connectivity)? 3. Discuss traffic impacts. 4. Discuss any remaining stakeholder concerns. 5. Staff technical review and amend concept as needed.	x	Mobility, Connectivity, Infrastructure
Vehicle	1st Avenue and Columbine	Suggested ped activated crossing across 1st to deal with existing ped crossings. This would require a pedestrian refuge in the median as well.	Staff review and response.	Determine through technical review if concept should be amended.		
Vehicle	5th Avenue and Josephine	Suggest DPW look at this intersection because right turn movements from west bound 5th onto Josephine cause problems on Josephine with on-coming traffic	Staff review and response.	Determine through technical review if concept should be amended.		
Vehicle	6th Avenue & Garfield	Several groups suggested a new traffic signal here, or move the platooning light to this intersection so that pedestrians and bicyclists can cross.	Staff review and response.	Determine through technical review if concept should be amended.		
Vehicle	East 1st Avenue	Several groups suggested new traffic signals or ped activated signals along East 1st Avenue. Most groups didn't specify a location. One group specified Madison.	Staff review and response.	Determine through technical review if concept should be amended.		