APPENDIX A: TECHNICAL MATERIAL

A.1 PLAN PURPOSE
A master plan is the principle document outlining a municipality’s direction, policy and action for the future. It is best used to guide and implement the coordinated physical development of the community in accordance with existing and future needs while not only considering but promoting the general welfare of the citizenry. A master plan acts as the basis for decision-making for governing bodies while guiding the private sector toward sustainable and beneficial activities that help to improve the community.

The 2008 Cherry Hills Village Master Plan acknowledges and plans for the kind of future desired by the village residents. The document is a narrative detailing the necessity for a plan update, the process used in developing the vision, goals and objectives, and the framework and strategies recommended to achieve the vision. This master plan was purposefully written to be a flexible tool that addresses land use, transportation, economic development, parks and recreation, public facilities, natural features, and recommended policy decisions. The 2008 Cherry Hills Village Master Plan is made up of one Master Plan chapter and three Appendices. The Master Plan has seven sections including Land Use / Development, Village Character, Open Space / Parks / Trails / Recreation, Village Center, Transportation, Utilities / Infrastructure, and Community Services. The Appendices include the Master Plan Process, Existing Conditions and the Community Survey.

The 2008 Cherry Hills Village Master Plan is based on five key assumptions:

1. The plan is intended as a general decision-making and implementation guide.
2. The plan recognizes market forces, limited resources, outside influences and other future issues.
3. The plan will be implemented through local zoning and subdivision regulations and through other non-regulatory policy and fiscal actions by the Village.
4. The plan is designed to achieve quality development reflecting the vision and goals of Cherry Hills Village.
5. The plan has been developed in compliance with Colorado State statutes.

Document Evolution
Primary implementation tools of a master plan include land use ordinances, regulations, economic development, policy decisions and budgetary prioritization. Priorities of a community over time may shift, thus the 2008 Cherry Hills Village Master Plan will need to be reviewed and adjusted on a regular basis with major evaluations occurring periodically. Thus a community’s plan is continually evolving.

By having regular reviews and periodic major evaluations, the 2008 Cherry Hills Village Master Plan becomes a viable instrument that is flexible enough to adapt to unanticipated changes yet it is strong enough to guide major public decisions to benefit the community.

Previous and Related Planning Endeavors
The City of Cherry Hills Village has completed various plans, studies and reports impacting the local road network, design and layout, land use, corridor development, parks and open spaces, and basic infrastructure needs. The plans and studies in question were all reviewed and taken into account throughout the development of the 2008 Cherry Hills Village Master Plan. As a result, many of the key concepts from
previous plans and studies have been incorporated into the Master Plan. The following are some of the major plans, studies and regulations reviewed:

- 1945 Zoning Map
- 1950 S.R. DeBoer Master Plan
- 1981 History of Annexation Study
- 1970 Master Plan
- 1993 Master Plan
- The Vision for Parks, Trails, Recreation, Historic Preservation and Open Space 2005 to 2020 (a.k.a. The Blue Ribbon Report)
- 2007 Dahlia Street Traffic Calming Study
- Citizen’s City Center Committee Report (2007)
- 2007 & 2008 City Budget
- Ordinance No. 06, Series 2007 (Stormwater)
- Cherry Hills Village Easement Book (2000)
- Cherry Hills Village Municipal Code

A.2 LEGAL AUTHORITY FOR PLANNING

All municipalities in Colorado are authorized to adopt, amend and carry out a plan through the activities of its planning commission. [Colorado Revised Statutes, Section 31-23-202]. A “master plan” is authorized for the following purposes:

- Guide and accommodate coordinated, adjusted and harmonious development of the municipality;
- Make policies in accordance with present and future needs;
- Promote the health, safety, order, convenience, prosperity and general welfare; and
- Create efficiency and economy in the process of development.

The Cherry Hills Village Master Plan and planning process give local and contemporary significance to all of these broad public interests in a manner that is unique to Cherry Hills Village.

A master plan or amendments are adopted by the planning commission by resolution requiring a 2/3 vote of the entire membership of the planning commission [Colorado Revised Statutes, Sections 31-23-206(1) and 208]. The plan and amendments are to be created with broad public input, requiring public notice and general public awareness of the plan and its contents, and allowing written and oral comments on the content and policies throughout the planning process [Colorado Revised Statutes, Sections 31-23-206(1)]. At least one formal public hearing is required prior to the planning commission adopting the plan or amendments. [Colorado Revised Statutes, Sections 31-23-208].

The contents of a master plan may address a broad range of topics with respect to physical development impacting the intended purposes for the plan, subject to their applicability in any particular municipality. Among those topics are transportation, public facilities and open spaces, utilities, future land uses and zoning controls, housing and natural, and environmental features (such as floodplains, wetlands, topography and habitats). [Colorado Revised Statutes, Sections 31-23-206(1)(a) – (k)]. In addition, Colorado municipalities are required to address the recreation and tourism needs of their residents and visitors. [Colorado Revised Statutes, Sections 31-23-206(5)]. The Cherry Hills Village planning process considered all of these elements, and addresses the Village’s present and future needs through the four main components of the Master Plan: Future Land Use; Transportation; Parks, Open Space, Trails and Recreation; and Village Character.
A municipal master plan adopted by a planning commission is an advisory document intended to guide future land development decisions. [Colorado Revised Statutes, Sections 31-23-206(1)] The policies, guiding principles, goals and strategies in the document only gain legal significance through the following municipal actions:

- Adoption and amendment of zoning regulations by the City Council, addressing the kinds and classes of buildings, use of buildings and land, and form and design of building, lots and open spaces on private development lots and sites. [Colorado Revised Statutes, Sections 31-23-301, 302 and 306];
- Adoption of subdivision regulations by the planning commission, addressing the proper arrangements of streets, open spaces, blocks and lots [Colorado Revised Statutes, Sections 31-23-214];
- Adoption of other authorized land development regulations of the municipality. [Colorado Revised Statutes, Sections 31-23-206(1)]

Additionally, the master plan does have legal authority to the extent that it addresses the general location, character and extent of any public facilities. Once included in a plan, all public facilities are required to be reviewed by the municipal planning commission for conformance to the master plan prior to being constructed in the municipality. On the occasion that any public facility is denied by the planning commission, they can only be constructed as originally proposed by the planning commission by at least a 2/3 vote of the governmental body with authority over the financing and construction of that public facility. [Colorado Revised Statutes, Sections 31-23-209]

A.3 PLANNING PROCESS

The planning process used in the creation of the Cherry Hills Village Master Plan is composed of eight general phases, while incorporating public input throughout the planning process. The eight phases are the following:

1. Data Collection, Issues and Assets Identification
2. Alternatives Development
3. Future Direction Development
4. Plan Development
5. Implementation Strategies
6. Plan Adoption
7. Plan Implementation
8. Plan Review and Update

1. Data Collection, Issues and Assets Identification

This first phase in the planning process is to become knowledgeable of the community and the regional context it is located in. This phase is conducted through the collection and examination of pertinent demographic, economic, infrastructure, topographical, policy and other quantitative data. Furthermore, this phase includes the identification of perceived opportunities and constraints of the local officials, staff, residents and other stakeholders through interviews and meetings.

2. Alternatives Development

A series of alternatives or schemes depicting future scenarios for Cherry Hills Village and the surrounding area was presented to city staff, the Advisory Committee and the general public. The creation of alternatives was based on information gathered and public input received. The overall intent of the alternatives is to promote discussion between citizens, either affirming or discounting the different components of the
Alternatives for the 2008 Cherry Hills Village Master Plan were created for the different key issues identified by the general public including:

- Land Development/Use
- Neighborhood Character
- Parks, Trails, Open Space & Recreation
- Transportation & Traffic
- Village Center

3. Preferred Direction Development
After collecting feedback on the presented alternatives, a final scenario, or preferred direction, was developed. Detailed in Chapters 2 through 7, the preferred direction sets the future pattern for the issue areas of Cherry Hills Village. Many of the policy recommendations will be aimed at achieving the components comprising the preferred direction.

4. Plan Development
This phase includes drafting and revising the 2008 Cherry Hills Village Master Plan. The framework of these drafts was established through the Preferred Direction and plan goals. Included in the plan is a series of recommendations, both policy and physical, for the city to undertake upon adoption of the 2008 Cherry Hills Village Master Plan.

5. Implementation Strategies
In this phase, detailed and comprehensive implementation strategies are developed. These strategies are to ensure that the plan recommendations and vision become a reality. Implementation Strategies are listed in Chapter 7: Implementation.

6. Plan Adoption
Adoption of the 2008 Cherry Hills Village Master Plan occurs when the plan has been officially endorsed by the municipality. Adoption of the plan happens after both the Planning & Zoning Commission and the City Council approve the presented plan through a vote.

7. Plan Implementation
Implementation of the adopted plan is achieved by cooperation among city officials, city staff, the private sector, public entities and the general public. This is often achieved by completing the recommendations and strategies detailed in the document. The realization of the plan and its contents is often the most difficult phase of the planning process. However, vested ownership of the plan is achieved by incorporating public involvement and input throughout the planning process. Community ownership in the plan is the best way to ensure success.

8. Plan Review and Update
Over time communities change as do their issues and goals. Changes in local officials and staff can occur and the priorities of the public can evolve. These issues and others can threaten the relevance and community ownership of the plan. Therefore, regular reviews and updates of the plan are recommended. Sub-section A.3 Document Evolution discusses this process.
A.4 Community Participation

Community participation details the methods used to ascertain the community’s input in developing the 2008 Cherry Hills Village Master Plan. Public input is essential to the success of the planning process and the master plan. Community ownership is instilled by incorporating public comments and ideas into the planning document. Community ownership is essential to the success of implementing the master plan’s direction and strategies.

A wide range of public input methods was incorporated into each phase of the planning process. The various forms of public input were intended to engage the broadest group of village residents. Receiving input from members of the community that are not typically involved with the daily undertaking of the local government and organizations is key to the success of the 2008 Cherry Hills Village Master Plan. This better ensures a more accurate representation of the community perception, opinion, values, issues and ideas. The methods of public input include an Advisory Committee, public meetings, open houses, a community survey and questionnaire, personal interviews, event flyers, a project website and Alternative Development Scenarios.

1. Advisory Committee

A project Advisory Committee was formed at the beginning of the planning process. The committee was comprised of seven residents that had the task to best represent the views and concerns of the general public. Furthermore, they played a critical role in creating excitement and increasing participation from the general public. The advisory committee included people from diverse occupational backgrounds including public officials, professionals, parents and members of the development community.

2. Public Meetings

Four public meetings were held during the planning process. Meetings were open to the general public. Each meeting was formatted in a slightly different manner; however, the basic goal for each was to seek public input and to further develop plan ownership.

Public Meeting One was conducted August 29, 2007 at Kent Denver School’s Student Center for the Arts. The meeting began with a presentation introducing the intent of the meeting, city staff and consulting team and reasons why city officials decided to update the previous Master Plan. There were over 168 attendees that were asked to identify their issues, values and hopes for Cherry Hills Village through a series of exercises. At the end of the evening the consultant team had collected over 110 responses to each of the exercises. The issues, values and hopes elicited from the meeting participants’ responses can be mostly grouped in the following six main categories:

- Traffic/Transportation
- Building/Development
- Open Space/Parks/Trails/Recreation
- Village Character
- Infrastructure/Services
- Policies/Regulations

The results of the exercises only reflect the collective opinion of the meeting’s attendees, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of Cherry Hills Village as a whole. However, the public input helped the consultant team and city staff to begin to gauge the importance of key issues for the future direction of the community.
Public Meeting Two was held on November 7, 2007 at Kent Denver School’s Student Center for the Arts. Different from the first meeting, Public Meeting Two was conducted in an open house format. Prior to the meeting the consultant team developed three unique Alternative Development Scenarios for each of the issue areas identified at the previous public meeting. The Alternative Development Scenarios are further discussed in the following sub-section A.5. At the open house, seven stations were set up to help easily direct the meeting attendees through the presented content of the meeting. The seven stations at the Open House included:

- Welcome/Sign-In Table and Project Status Board
- Village Vision and Future Land Use
- Land Development & Use
- Neighborhood Character
- Parks, Trails, Open Space & Recreation
- Transportation & Traffic
- Village Center

Public Meeting Three and Four were held between July and September 2008. The intent of the third public meeting was to hear comments from the public regarding the draft Master Plan and for the Planning and Zoning Commission to recommend adoption of the plan at the conclusion of the meeting. The fourth public meeting is a City Council hearing. At this meeting the public has the opportunity to make additional comments on the draft master plan before it is adopted by the City Council.

3. Community Survey & Questionnaire

Survey
A scientific community survey was conducted by the consultant to determine a random sampling of the community at large. The Community Survey asked questions related to Village issues including Transportation/Traffic, Parks/Open Space/Trails/Recreation, Building/Zoning, Village Center, and Future Funding and Actions. Results from the community survey can be found in Appendix C: Community Survey.

Questionnaire
Prior to the first public meeting, city staff and the consultant team compiled a Questionnaire that was sent to all Cherry Hills Village residents. The intent of the Questionnaire was to not only get the public thinking about the future of Cherry Hills Village but to ask key questions regarding what they value in the village and what they believe are goals for the village. At the end of the questionnaire, the residents were given six different ways to achieve these and were asked to rank in order which they would prefer more or less. Below is the rank, in order, of what policies Cherry Hills Village residents would prefer in order to achieve their goals.

1. Use existing resources to prioritize and phase implementation of values and hopes over a long period of time.
2. Seek outside funding from grants and other revenue sources (state/federal government, corporations, organizations, foundations, etc.).
3. Create public/private or non-profit partnerships.
4. Create special or earmarked tax districts and funding approaches (use/user fees, improvement districts).
5. Increase property taxes.
6. Support development opportunities that increase property valuation (increased residential intensity/density, targeted commercial development).
7. Others: Develop a commercial tax base, Do nothing, Conservation easements, Density increasing sources, Spend existing revenue on infrastructure.
4. Community Interviews
Throughout the planning process the consultant team met with many members and stakeholders in Cherry Hills Village. Roughly 20 interviews were conducted in person during the beginning phases of the planning project. A list of the interviewees was created from input by city staff and the Planning and Zoning Commission and Master Plan Advisory Committee. The diverse group of interviewees included large land owners, long time residents, current and past local political leaders and representatives of education institutions and other not-for-profit organizations. The goal of the interviews was to help the consultant team better understand the perspectives, opinions and potential endeavors of the interviewees. Because of the critical information shared in these interviews, the Community Interviews were purposefully closed to the public and therefore will not be released in other forums for further public input.

5. Other Public Input Methods
Public input methods, other than the methods listed prior, were used to help increase meeting turnout and involvement throughout the planning process. Such methods include event flyers and invitations, Village Crier articles, Villager articles and the project website. Event flyers and invitations were mailed out to each resident. The project website was developed as a way to communicate project status, information and products to the general public. Presentations, graphics, meeting results, comment sheets, text documents and draft plans were posted on the website and were available to download. Furthermore, residents were encouraged to stop by the Village Center to ask questions regarding the Master Plan and to request printed copies of the Master Plan materials.

A.5 ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS
By collecting and analyzing public input and comments along with Existing Conditions data throughout the initial phases of the Master Plan, the plan consultants were able to identify 5 key issues in Cherry Hills Village:
1. Land Development & Use
2. Neighborhood Character
3. Parks, Trails, Open Space & Recreation
4. Transportation & Traffic
5. Village Center

Three Alternative Development Scenarios were created for each key issue by the consultant team. The different Alternative Development Scenarios were intended to give Cherry Hills Village residents three purposefully different approaches to solving these key issues. These Alternatives Development Scenarios were presented to the public at a November 7, 2007 public open house at Kent Denver School’s Student Center for the Arts. The purpose of the alternatives was to create discussion and dialogue amongst city officials, staff and the public. The reason for presenting the future development scenarios in such a manner was for the viewers to determine which components they wanted to see in the future and which components they disapproved of. From the comments and feedback received at the open house, the plan consultants were able to create a preferred direction for the future of Cherry Hills Village. The preferred direction would be a hybrid of the desired components of the alternatives as opposed to the selection of one single alternative.
A.5.1 Land Development & Use

Land Development and Use pertains to how to address the current development patterns and land uses in Cherry Hills Village. The Future Land Use map displayed at the Open House indicated that all properties in Cherry Hills Village remain in their current use in the future. However, as property values continue to increase, some of these properties may become susceptible to market pressure to change in use. Property owners presented with opportunities to move or to sell portions of property may sell to new owners that desire to subdivide or change the use of the property. The alternatives listed below are intended to raise the question of what is an acceptable approach toward addressing the potential land development and use pattern for such properties in the future. Along with determining what they like and dislike about each alternative, residents of Cherry Hills Village were asked to identify photographs they liked from a photo board pertaining to Land Development & Use.

Alternative One: Single-Family Residential

This scenario reflects a development and use pattern in which both interior and perimeter properties in the Village are developed as single family residential property. The density or intensity of development allowed is determined by the context of the property given adjacent land use and applicable zoning.

In most cases the development intensity or density would occur within the 1 to 2½ acre range. Considerations include:

- New development occurs in a manner that is most reflective of adjacent uses and neighborhoods
- Increase in property tax revenue as new residential property may replace non-tax paying entities
- Density of new development occurs within the context of existing regulations

Alternative Two: Targeted Residential Increase

This scenario identifies limited locations (on the perimeter of the Village) where some increase in residential density may be acceptable. This future development would occur according to market demands, but may allow for some living formats that are currently not available or are not prominent in the Village. Such residential formats may include town homes, patio homes and assisted living for seniors. No commercial development would be allowed in this scenario. Considerations include:

- Additional residential living choices are
provided within Cherry Hills Village that allow "downsizing" or lower property maintenance living arrangements.

- Design criteria developed to address increased density that may only occur on the perimeter of the village.
- Several small parcels will remain institutional in use.

**Alternative Three: Limited Mixed-Use / Open Space**

This scenario reflects a very limited and controlled mixed-use development pattern on properties adjacent to Hampden only. Other properties may remain institutional or develop into single family residential. Entire or significant portions of some properties may become open space.

Mixed–use development would be limited to a small amount of neighborhood oriented commercial and office use on the first floor with residential use above. Strict design criteria would limit the location, intensity / density of the development, as well as the incorporation of open space, landscaping and pedestrian connections. Considerations include:

- Possible small amount of new sales tax revenue for the Village, and some additional property tax.
- Possibility for provision of new neighborhood oriented open space.
- Any increased density or intensity of use only occurs on properties adjacent to Hampden.

**A.5.2 Neighborhood Character**

Neighborhood Character pertains to policy decisions intended to keep the existing character of each neighborhood in place. Looking at a neighborhood or area we all perceive different things - the architecture of the buildings, the use of certain landscape materials or themes, the framework of the public space, the design of the roadway, etc. Each of these elements and other perceived items makes up the character of a neighborhood.

In Cherry Hills Village there are a number of different neighborhoods, many of which have unique neighborhood character. Some neighborhoods, have uniform elements, other neighborhoods have a very eclectic mix of elements. In some neighborhoods design and development are guided by property covenants, in others they are not. Neighborhood character can be changed by both the actions of individual property owners and the government.

The application of public policy (in the form of regulations or incentives) and design of public improvements (roads, open spaces, etc.) influence the character of both the entire Village and specific neighborhoods. As you consider the different approaches to and strategies for addressing elements of Neighborhood Character, it is important to determine if the approach is applicable Village-wide or only to a neighborhood or specific geographic area. Participants at the Open House were asked to determine if they prefer a Village-Wide Application of regulations or incentives or if they prefer a Neighborhood- or Area-Specific Application of these regulations and incentives.

**Village-Wide Application**

A common, Village-wide approach to addressing elements of neighborhood character is easier for the Village to administer through the broad application of similar character items throughout the village.
Individual differences in neighborhoods could be compromised through a uniform approach to roadway design, landscaping or building regulations, and other elements of character. However, the approach would tend to be easily applicable to problems that are common to all neighborhoods and/or be general enough so that differences among neighborhoods are not compromised. A common village-wide approach must have broad based consensus to implement effectively.

**Neighborhood- or Area-Specific Application**

A neighborhood or area-specific approach to addressing neighborhood character items could become more difficult for the Village to administer if there are many distinctions among areas or neighborhoods, or if the elements that make up neighborhood character are complex. Other entities or organizations that exist or could be formed may assist with administering and enforcing such an approach. However, a Neighborhood- or Area-Specific approach can begin to address issues differently in different neighborhoods or areas. Therefore potential solutions may become more detailed and focused on addressing the needs / desires of each specific area.

Neighborhood Character is susceptible to change. In some parts of Cherry Hills Village residential property is being redeveloped. Older homes are being bought, torn down and rebuilt. These new homes are generally much larger than the homes they are replacing. An area or neighborhood that once contained ranch style homes of several thousand square feet may be experiencing a conversion, one lot at a time, to two story homes that may be several times larger than the previous homes. Throughout the country this tear down process is related to the creation of "McMansions." In some places this is seen as a threat to the desire to preserve or maintain neighborhood character. In other places it is seen as a necessary market driven reinvestment in the neighborhood.

There are different ways to approaching this issue. One way involves changing development regulations or creating advisory guidelines that address building location, mass, volume or design. Participants at the Open House were asked to determine which, if any, of the development regulations might work in their neighborhood.

**Alternative One: Typical Building Envelope**

This approach reflects the current and basic approach to building size and placement issues on residential lots. It aims at minimizing impacts on adjacent properties through basic setbacks. Within the measured setbacks, and subject to height limits, there is little or no regulation as to what individual properties may build in terms of building mass or design.

The larger the lot the larger potential structures may be, as the setbacks are keyed to lot boundaries and the buildable area increases accordingly with lot sizes. This approach basically sets a "building envelop." Technically, a building could fill this entire building envelope, meaning buildings in one neighborhood can vary dramatically in mass even when setbacks are uniformly applied. Furthermore, existing buildings typically occupy far less than their potential building envelope.
Alternative Two: Floating Footprint
This approach focuses on breaking down the mass of the buildable area allowed in the "building envelop" by limiting the allowable building footprint. The allowed footprint is usually keyed to some percentage of the lot area or different tiers of lot sizes, so that the permitted footprint is most often less than the area within the setback.

From property to property the location of the building footprint may vary to any location within the setbacks. This approach attempts to build some compatibility in building sizes in locations where lot sizes may vary. By freezing footprints at an acceptable size larger lots do not have an exponentially larger buildable area resulting from the increased area within setback lines. Within the allowed "floating building envelop" there are little or no standards with respect to what individual owners may build in terms of mass and design.

Alternative Three: Bulk/Plane
This approach focuses on breaking down the mass of larger buildings by requiring different massing elements or "planes" to be regulated. These regulations can be keyed to adjacent properties (not allowing building masses within imaginary inclined planes tiering back from property boundaries), or keyed to the structure (not allowing larger planes on the built structure without off-sets, step backs or other relief features that break up the mass of buildings).

Typically this approach does not necessarily result in smaller buildings, although they could be used in combination with a "floating foot-print regulation. Also, this approach can get fairly specific and complex with massing standards. It does not address any elements of design or architectural style other than focusing the largest massing of a building into a desired location on the property.

Alternative Four: Design Guidelines
This approach focuses on the design or architectural character of residential structures. Standards may be either regulatory (legislated and required by the city) or guidelines (recommended practices from the city or some other neighborhood organization).

The degree of specificity can vary widely within this approach ranging from simple massing standards or basic material
specifications to specifying appropriate architectural techniques for a particular style or range of styles that may be appropriate in the general context. This approach can become complex, so in addition to drafting the appropriate design standards, a mechanism for review and enforcement must be established, such as a Design or Architectural Review Board.

A.5.3 Parks, Trails, Open Space & Recreation

Parks, Trails, Open Space & Recreation pertains to how to further develop the existing parks and trails system. The area of parks, trails, open space and recreation is complex in Cherry Hills Village. There are issues related to ownership, funding, programming and on-going maintenance. In order to effectively address the issues and complexities related to this topic it is important to develop a strategic system goal or framework to work toward.

Three alternative frameworks for the parks, trails, open space and recreation system are outlined below. There are other alternatives but these depict three distinct methods. Along with determining what they like and dislike about each alternative, residents of Cherry Hills Village were asked to identify photographs they liked from a photo board pertaining to Parks, Trails, Open Space & Recreation.

Alternative One: Network

This approach focuses on the Village’s open space and trails as the foundation for an interconnected system that would primarily provide passive recreation opportunities. It would prioritize acquisition and control of local areas that complete the network. Areas or features that are not determined to be essential to the network would have low priority. Important elements of the network may include dedicated off-street or on-street connections to the High Line Canal in the most direct and convenient routes, “pocket parks” at trail heads and preservation of larger environmental assets along the trail system. This approach would require a detailed open space master plan to establish priority connections and key components of the overall system, and would require a dedicated funding source for public acquisition of the most important portions of the system. Considerations include:

- Need to establish parks, trails, open space master plan.
- Strategic acquisition of land would be based on priorities within the system and availability of dedicated resources / funding.
- The Village would focus on system development and maintenance; other entities may pursue other opportunities.
that are not identified in the system master plan.

- May create a hierarchy of management practices that focuses on determination of important or essential areas.

**Alternative Two: Opportunistic.**

This approach focuses on acquiring, preserving or otherwise reserving open space opportunities wherever they may arise. Although not necessarily focused on efforts to complete a specific system of open space, efforts may still be prioritized with consideration to specific Neighborhood needs. Different approaches to providing different types of opportunities may exist in different neighborhoods. Efforts to dedicate open spaces may be based on partnerships between the Village and other entities, and may require an incentive-based program, where tax credits, redirection of development capacity or other regulatory and non-regulatory benefits are conveyed to private land-holders. A key aspect of this policy is that it would be based on opportunities that arise as landowners’ plans, positions and interests shift. With this approach any opportunity is valued but the method by which opportunities are addressed occurs on a case-by-case basis. Considerations include:

- Providing park, trails, open space and recreation opportunities is based on needs of individual neighborhoods / areas.
- Strong partnerships need to be formed to leverage resources in light of the pursuit of multiple opportunities at a given time.
- Very random approach.
- Could be complex from an administrative and implementation standpoint.

**Alternative Three: Recreation Provision**

This approach focuses on the Village’s role in providing both passive and active recreation opportunities. While many recreation services would be provided by other entities outside the village, the Village would seek to offer some supplemental passive and active recreation services. For example, the Village may supplement current active recreation opportunities provided through partnerships with educational institutions, or the Village may incorporate multiuse open space for sport practice opportunities. Recreation opportunities may include community outdoor event (small festival, celebration or concert) space or indoor meeting space in new building facilities, or small active park space. Open space and trail networks would be maintained and expanded in a similar fashion to the Village’s current approach. Considerations include:
A.5.4 Transportation & Traffic

Transportation and Traffic pertains to how to address traffic problems and how to approach developing a whole transportation system. Transportation and traffic issues in Cherry Hills Village involve both local and metropolitan mobility. Several agencies are involved with moving people in, around and through the Village. The following alternatives describe three different ways of looking at or organizing the system for moving people in, around and through the Village. Along with determining what they like and dislike about each alternative, residents of Cherry Hills Village were asked to identify photographs they liked from a photo board pertaining to Transportation and Traffic.

Alternative One: Local Calming

[Yellow:] Institute a program for traffic calming on local connecting streets. This program, although maintaining alternate through connections, would discourage cut-through traffic between the major arterials, and may make some local trips less convenient. Most regional trips and many local trips would be routed to the perimeter arterials and University Boulevard.

[Purple:] Perimeter arterials and University Boulevard will likely experience an increase in traffic and congestion, in addition to the projected regional traffic growth forecasted for these streets. The Village will work with the State on state-controlled streets to promote policies against widening and expanding the capacity and speeds on these streets, and accept congestion and inconvenience that occurs due to increased traffic. Some pedestrian and bike improvements may be possible within existing rights-of-ways. This process may increase difficulty entering and exiting the Village along the perimeter streets and University Boulevard.

Considerations include:
- Would reduce internal traffic at cost of regional connections.
• Total travel time may increase with traffic calming devices and circuitous paths.
• Walking and biking along city streets would be improved.

Alternative Two: Local Connecting
[Yellow:] Institute a local program for improved vehicle connections on local streets and perimeter streets. These connections can provide residents with alternative routes to the perimeter streets for moving about the Village. Traffic calming would not be a principle part of this program as it could impact the convenience of alternative routes, although improvements for pedestrian and bicycle connections balanced with vehicle traffic would be important. Due to prioritizing these alternative routes, some cut-through traffic from regional transportation routes may be expected.

[Purple:] The alternative connections from local streets may provide some relief to congestion on the perimeter arterials and University Boulevard, primarily from allowing local inter-city trips on these streets to be reduced, but also by accommodating some share of the forecasted regional impact on these streets. In addition, the Village would proactively work with the State on state-controlled rights-of-way for a program of calming traffic on perimeter arterials. Traffic calming, including mode interfaces of pedestrian, bikes and vehicles, would be a particular priority at intersections of local streets with the perimeter arterials and University Boulevard to allow safer crossings onto regional routes.

Considerations include:
• Would improve regional connections at cost of increased internal traffic.
• Total travel time may decrease with improved alternative routes.
• Walking and biking safety would be improved at key intersections and corridors.

Alternative Three: Proactive Regional Partnership
[Yellow:] Institute a local program for “Complete Streets” that emphasizes bicycle and pedestrian facilities for transportation purposes (not purely recreation). Not all streets would require dedicated or enhanced facilities as vehicle speeds and volumes may be low enough for all three modes of transportation to compatibly mix within the Right-of-Way (ROW) requiring minimal improvements. However, many priority local streets would require designs focusing on the utility of all three modes. Traffic calming would only be introduced in these designs if it is necessary to effectively balance and enhance multi-modal transportation movements, and would not be instituted solely to discourage or hinder vehicle traffic. Some cut-through traffic from regional patterns of all three modes of traffic may be expected on local streets.

[Purple:] Work with the State on state-controlled ROW to institute a similar policy and system of “Complete Streets,” emphasizing multi-modal transportation aspects of perimeter arterials. Additionally, the Village would be an active partner in regional transportation discussions, recognizing the role of these streets in the regional system, but specifically focusing on transit connections, transportation demand management and other broad and comprehensive transportation policies that could reduce the share of regional vehicle traffic growth projected for these streets.
Considerations include:

- Pedestrian and bicycle enhancements would provide additional travel choices.
- Walking and biking safety would be improved, but improved facilities could impact adjacent land uses.
- Broad and comprehensive transportation policies such as transit and travel demand management might have little impact on traffic within Cherry Hills Village.
- Pedestrian and bicycle improvements may increase use of alternative modes but might not noticeably reduce vehicle traffic.

A.5.5 Village Center

Village Center pertains to how to address the development and redevelopment of the Village Center into a community collection and activity node. Recently the Citizen’s City Center Committee submitted to the City Council its report regarding recommendations for the Village Center and the associated public land and functions. The alternative building and property configurations below utilize the recommended site plan from that report as a base. The concepts reflect possibilities at the Village Center location.

Alternative One: Municipal

This approach envisions a future Village Center that strengthens the municipal function of this area. Priority is placed on designing a new municipal facility as the focal point, meeting municipal court functions and space needs as well as improving Village Center facilities. Public safety (fire and police) play a prominent role in reconfiguring this area, not only from a functional standpoint, but in serving as a focal point and promoting community outreach efforts.

These municipal facilities are centered on a semi-formal outdoor civic space with a feeling of connection to the elementary school. John Meade park and the equestrian facilities remain in their current functional capacity, with consideration of incorporating a small...
amphitheatre and informal sports practice area. Considerations include:

- Focus on providing for municipal functions.
- Creates a connection to Cherry Hills Village Elementary School.
- Increases potential use of John Meade Park.

**Alternative Two: Community Gathering**

This approach envisions a future Village Center that emphasizes a greater community gathering function. The municipal function area would include improved space for City Hall, Municipal Court, Public Safety (Police and Fire), focused on the central open space and drive up area. These facilities would also have space for community based meetings and events.

A small outdoor event space is also included – this area could be used for small community gatherings and events. John Meade Park would remain in its current configuration and primarily serve as a passive recreation and environmental experience. Along the trails may be located several pieces of public art to form a community “art walk.” All of these elements would be designed to re-enforce the informal and natural character of this area. Considerations include:

- Expands the potential for indoor and outdoor community gatherings and events
- Highlights passive recreation and environmental experience of John Meade Park

**Alternative Three: Public Use**

This approach envisions a future Village Center that introduces the idea of expanding the daily public use of the Village Center. Pedestrian-oriented buildings would be located close to Quincy and include patio or courtyard seating, for informal citizen gathering outdoors.

An improved building supports Village Hall, Municipal Court, police and fire functions. Additional building area could include some public meeting rooms, a small community library or history / archive area, small postal service area and possibly a small coffee stand with indoor seating area, reading room and internet hot spot for citizens. John Meade Park serves the same functions as it does today but incorporates small outdoor environmental classrooms for use by local education institutions. Considerations include:

- Unique opportunity to partner with local education institutions.
- Creates a informal daily community activity place.
- Potential for more traffic in the area on a daily basis.