



# WESTMINSTER

## Staff Report

TO: The Mayor and Members of the City Council

DATE: May 11, 2005

SUBJECT: Study Session Agenda for May 16, 2005

PREPARED BY: Brent McFall, City Manager

*Please Note: Study Sessions and Post City Council meetings are open to the public, and individuals are welcome to attend and observe. However, these meetings are not intended to be interactive with the audience, as this time is set aside for City Council to receive information, make inquiries, and provide Staff with policy direction.*

Looking ahead to next Monday night's Study Session, the following schedule has been prepared:

*A light dinner will be served in the Council Family Room*

6:00 P.M.

### CONSENT AGENDA

None at this time.

### CITY COUNCIL REPORTS

1. Report from Mayor (5 minutes)
2. Reports from City Councillors (10 minutes)

### PRESENTATIONS

1. Municipal Court Quarterly Update
2. Growth Management Program Amendment for Reclaimed Water Projects
3. Criteria to be used by City Council in making Land Use decisions

6:30 P.M.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

1. Economic Development Prospect
2. Holly Park Update

### INFORMATION ONLY

1. Monthly Residential Development Report – Attachment
2. Amendment Request to Denver Regional Council of Governments Metro Vision 2030

Additional items may come up between now and Monday night. City Council will be apprised of any changes to the Study Session meeting schedule.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall

City Manager

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: John A. Stipech, Presiding Judge

DATE: May 16, 2005

SUBJECT: Court Status

**INTRODUCTION:** This document is a summary of the Court's activities from Jan 1<sup>st</sup> to the end of April 2005 and generally describes the current state of the Court Administration.

### I. Court Caseload

The following statistical information compares the filings in the Municipal Court for 2005 with the same statistical information for the same timeframe in 2004.

COURT	YTD	YTD	Difference
	Jan - April 2005	Jan - April 2004	
Municipal Ordinance (aka Criminal)	992	954	4%
Domestic Violence	93	127	-27%
<b>Total Criminal</b>	<b>1,085</b>	<b>1,081</b>	<b>0%</b>
No Proof of Insurance	0	1,160	-100%
Traffic Mandatory (aka Criminal)	104	170	-39%
Traffic Payable (aka Infraction)	3,622	2,956	23%
<b>Total Traffic without parking</b>	<b>3,726</b>	<b>4,286</b>	<b>-13%</b>
<b>Total Criminal &amp; Traffic w/o parking</b>	<b>4,811</b>	<b>5,367</b>	<b>-10%</b>
Parking	632	518	22%
<b>Court Grand Total</b>	<b>5,443</b>	<b>5,885</b>	<b>-8%</b>

The above chart shows some encouraging trends in the Court filings this year. The Domestic Violence caseload has decreased 27% through the end of April compared to the same time last year. We are hopeful that this trend will continue for the balance of the year. The Police Department began filing No Proof of Insurance (NPOI) violations in the County Court in November of last year. The State Courts are supposed to refer back part of the revenue collected to the municipality issuing the summons. I have no information on how much, if any, has been received by Westminster. Even though the filings in the County Courts have impacted the filings in the Municipal Court, our statistics have remained fairly constant. The big impact on the filings

in our Court is the secondary charges associated with the No Proof of Insurance violations that are also being filed in the County Court. For instance, if an officer stops an individual for running a red light and the driver is unable to show proof of insurance, the officer writes both offenses into the County Court. The upside to filing the No Proof of Insurance violations in the County Court is that we do not have to deal with restitution issues that are very problematic for us. The downside is a significant loss of revenue from both the NPOIs and the secondary violations. The loss of revenues may be offset by payments Adams and Jefferson Counties are supposed to be making to the City as a result of our filing the NPOIs in the State Court.

**II. Probation Section**

The Probation Section lost a very capable employee, Sue Cleery, who moved on to the State Probation System. The position has been filled by a very experienced individual by the name of Leah Salazar who comes to our Court from the Lakewood Probation Department where she has been a Probation Officer for four years. The Probation staff has done a monumental job in handling our caseload and has provided invaluable services not only to the Court, but to the Prosecutors and the Court Administrative Supervisors. The chart below summarizes the current caseload being handled by the Probation Section compared to the same time period in 2004.

	<b>April-05</b>	<b>Apr-04</b>	<b>Difference</b>
Total active caseload on probation	624	506	23%
Total active Domestic Violence Probationers	251	230	9%
Number of active volunteers	7	9	-22%
Cases supervised by volunteers	11	9	22%
Supervised probation caseload	205	159	29%
Unsupervised probation caseload	408	338	21%
Total adult caseload	481	412	17%
Total juvenile caseload	143	94	52%
Pre-sentence investigations completed	15	12	25%

**III. Court Activities**

We are unhappy to report that we received the resignation of Sandra Trujillo who has accepted the position of Court Administrator for the City of Golden. We will miss her expertise and knowledge that she demonstrated in her position as Deputy Court Administrator for our City. We are in the process of seeking a new individual to fill her position. While we have suffered a loss of her services, we are proud of the fact that we have trained three Deputy Court Administrators who have gone on to become Court Administrators in other jurisdictions.

We are fortunate that our Court staff has stabilized and has been cross-trained to facilitate any contingencies. We will be at full strength when our next positions are filled, which should occur soon. We have been selected to be one of the first Divisions to go on line in submitting our payroll information.

Everything is going smoothly and I do not anticipate any problems. Our Court Administrator Carol Barnhardt is in the process of hiring a new Deputy Court Administrator among a myriad of other projects. The Court staff is working well together and is striving to keep our customer service at a high level. We continue to receive outstanding support from the City Manager's Office and other departments in the City and have our Department Head Matt Lutkus to call upon when we cannot solve a particular problem.

#### **IV. Conclusion:**

The first four months of 2005 have gone fairly well. The new hirings at the Police Department have resulted in increased filings in our Court that offset the loss of No Proof of Insurance violations that averaged about 275 per month last year. As the new recruits are integrated into the system we anticipate they will be writing more traffic citations and criminal violations into our Court. We are well equipped at least at this juncture to handle any increased filings.

cc. Brent McFall  
Steve Smithers  
Marty McCullough  
Matt Lutkus



## Staff Report

City Council Study Session Meeting  
May 16, 2005



SUBJECT: Growth Management Program Amendment for Reclaimed Water Projects

PREPARED BY: Shannon Sweeney, Planning Coordinator

### Recommended City Council Action:

Direct Staff to prepare an ordinance for City Council action amending the Growth Management Program. The amendment would establish annual allocations to the reclaimed water category (Category R) that equal the Service Commitment supply figure for the reclaimed system. Upon Council's direction, staff will schedule the Councillor's Bill and Resolution revising the 2005 Category R Service Commitment allocation for the June 13 City Council meeting.

### Summary Statement

- Each year, City Council allocates Service Commitments (SCs) to each of the various Growth Management Program categories to serve new development needs in the upcoming year, and SCs for all of the categories, with the exception of Category R come from the City's potable water system. Currently the same criteria and process are used to determine allocations for the reclaimed and potable water categories, although the objective of each system is different.
- With the potable water system, the City must ensure it does not allocate more SCs than the City can "effectively and safely absorb" to serve the growth. However, with the reclaimed water system, the effort is to maximize use of the system as soon as possible to encourage use of reclaimed water, rather than potable water, for irrigation purposes.
- Because connection to the reclaimed system is encouraged in order to maximize use of the system, Staff recommends a Growth Management Program amendment that would allocate a number of Category R SCs each year equivalent to the SC capacity number for the reclaimed system, rather than allocating based upon anticipated project demand as done historically. The current reclaimed water system capacity is 2,508 service commitments.
- This would eliminate the need for Staff to process supplemental SC allocation resolutions with City Council for this category during the year each time additional developers are able to connect to the system or if additional reclaimed SCs are needed for a project. These situations are advantageous to the City by reducing the impact on the potable system and increasing use of the reclaimed system. This would also enable City Council to monitor the capacity number each year, but no limitations up to the capacity would be placed on new development.
- This amendment would not change the way in which SCs are allocated to the potable water categories.

**Expenditure Required:** \$0

**Source of Funds:** N/A

## **Policy Issue**

Should the City change the way in which annual Service Commitment allocations are made to the Reclaimed Water Category (Category R) within the City's Growth Management Program?

## **Alternative**

Direct Staff not to pursue a Growth Management Program amendment that would change the way the City allocates Service Commitments to the Reclaimed Water Category. Annual allocations to Category R would continue to be based upon anticipated demand in the upcoming year. In cases where Staff is able to encourage additional developers to connect to the reclaimed system or if users require more reclaimed water SCs than originally estimated during the year, Staff would prepare a supplemental allocation resolution for Council consideration each time this occurs. Because each instance requires time to process the resolution, delays are possible for awarding additional reclaimed SCs to a project. Staff does not recommend this option and believes the proposed change is a more effective and efficient way to allocate SCs from the reclaimed system. Staff does not anticipate any negative impacts with the proposed amendment.

## **Background Information**

Each year Staff lists the projects in the City's review process that will likely require Service Commitments (SCs) in the upcoming year, estimates the SCs that will be needed for each project, and reviews this information with City Council. Staff uses the most up-to-date information available when calculating the projections, but many variables can affect the amount allocated in any given year including:

- Changes to building size and landscape area can occur during the development review process, sometimes drastically changing the number of SCs needed for projects;
- Projects originally anticipated as potable water projects may be able to connect to the reclaimed system instead;
- New, unexpected projects may be submitted for review and require SCs in any given year;
- Anticipated projects may be withdrawn; and,
- Developers may overestimate or underestimate their anticipated timeline, making it difficult to know which year the award will be necessary for the project, particularly when the timeline falls near the end or beginning of a year.

In cases where the allocation set aside for a particular year cannot meet the needs of the new users, Staff drafts a supplemental allocation resolution for Council consideration, and if approved, the additional SCs needed are available. This action has not been necessary in many years as Staff attempts to plan for all possible projects based on estimated timelines, and enough SCs have been available in the categories each year.

Recently, Water Resources Staff within the Public Works and Utilities Department and the Parks Division determined a greater number of reclaimed SCs would be necessary to accommodate the new Westfield Village Park at 114<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Wolff Street than originally anticipated. A total of 32 SCs were set aside for the park in the reclaimed allocation for 2005, but the adjusted figure necessary is 102 SCs. Of the original total allocation of 137 reclaimed SCs, approximately 90 SCs remain, not

enough to meet the needs of the new park and additional SCs that will be needed during the remainder of 2005.

Rather than draft a supplemental allocation resolution for this category, Staff has prepared a Growth Management Program amendment changing the way in which SCs are allocated to the reclaimed water category (Category F). Since it is advantageous to the City to maximize use of the reclaimed system as soon as possible, Staff recommends annual allocations that match the SC supply figure for the reclaimed system (currently 2,500 SCs) and using anticipated demand figures when establishing allocations is not as effective for the reclaimed category. This is not the case with the potable water system where the effort is to manage SCs awards so that the City can provide the infrastructure and services necessary to serve that growth. Staff would continue to provide City Council with anticipated demand figures when determining annual allocations in the potable water categories.

Attached are drafts of the ordinance language and resolution that have been reviewed and approved by the City Attorney's Office. If City Council supports this amendment, Staff will finalize these attachments and prepare these for Council consideration at the June 13 City Council meeting. If City Council does not support the amendment, Staff will prepare a supplemental allocation resolution for Council to allocate additional reclaimed SCs to accommodate the Westfield Village Park.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager

Attachments

- Draft of Proposed Ordinance
- Draft of Proposed Resolution



BY AUTHORITY

**DRAFT**

ORDINANCE NO.

COUNCILLOR'S BILL NO.

SERIES OF 2005

INTRODUCED BY COUNCILLORS

---

A BILL

FOR AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 3 OF TITLE XI OF THE WESTMINSTER  
MUNICIPAL CODE CONCERNING THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM ALLOCATIONS  
TO THE RECLAIMED WATER CATEGORY

THE CITY OF WESTMINSTER ORDAINS:

Section 1: Section 11-3-5, W.M.C., is hereby amended by THE ADDITION OF A NEW  
SUBSECTION (M) to read as follows:

**11-3-5: ALLOCATION AND ISSUANCE OF SERVICE COMMITMENTS:**

**(M) ALLOCATIONS TO CATEGORY R (RECLAIMED WATER) WILL EQUAL THE SERVICE  
COMMITMENT CAPACITY OF THE RECLAIMED WATER SYSTEM.**

Section 2. Severability: If any section, paragraph, clause, word or any other part of this Ordinance  
shall for any reason be held to be invalid or unenforceable by a court of competent jurisdiction, such part  
deemed unenforceable shall not affect any of the remaining provisions.

Section 3. This ordinance shall take effect upon its passage after second reading.

Section 4. The title and purpose of this ordinance shall be published prior to its consideration on  
second reading. The full text of this ordinance shall be published within ten (10) days after its enactment  
after second reading.

INTRODUCED, PASSED ON FIRST READING, AND TITLE AND PURPOSE ORDERED  
PUBLISHED this 13th day of June, 2005.

PASSED, ENACTED ON SECOND READING, AND FULL TEXT ORDERED PUBLISHED this  
27<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2005.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

RESOLUTION

RESOLUTION NO.

INTRODUCED BY COUNCILLORS

SERIES OF 2005

**ALLOCATING SERVICE COMMITMENTS TO CATEGORY R (RECLAIMED WATER) FOR THE YEAR 2005 PURSUANT TO THE CITY'S GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AS SET FORTH IN CHAPTER 3, TITLE XI OF THE WESTMINSTER MUNICIPAL CODE**

WHEREAS, the City of Westminster has adopted by Ordinance a Growth Management Program through 2010; and

WHEREAS, the City's Growth Management Program as set forth in Chapter 3, Title XI of the Westminster City Code calls for the periodic determination of the availability of Service Commitments and allocation of such Service Commitments among various categories of potential users; and

WHEREAS, Category R is the Reclaimed Water category for irrigation use by projects that connect to the City's reclaimed water system; and

WHEREAS, it is the intent of the City to encourage connection to and use of the reclaimed water system to reduce demand on the City's potable water system; and

WHEREAS, it is in the City's best interest to encourage use of the reclaimed water system for irrigation purposes up to the capacity limits of the system as soon as possible; and

WHEREAS, the current reclaimed water system capacity is 2,508 Service Commitments.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the City Council of Westminster, in accordance with Sections 11-3-4 and 11-3-5 of the Official Code of the City of Westminster, hereby determines that:

1. Based on all of the information available to the City Council on this date, for the period beginning January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005, the City can make available 2,508 Service Commitments ("SCs") to Category R without adverse effect on existing water users and without in any way endangering the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Westminster and of other persons dependent upon the operation of a safe and efficient public water and sanitation system by the City.

2. This Resolution supersedes and replaces all previous Category R allocation resolutions by City Council.

Passed and adopted this 13th day of June, 2005.

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
City Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mayor



W E S T M I N S T E R

## Staff Report

Information Only Staff Report  
May 16, 2005



SUBJECT: Criteria and Standards for Land Use Applications

PREPARED BY: David A. Shinneman, Planning Manager

### Summary Statement:

This report is for City Council information only and requires no action by City Council. The intent of this report is to provide City Council with the Criteria and Standards to be used in reviewing an application for approval for various land use applications.

### Background Information

City staff has pulled together the attached list of Criteria and Standards to be used in reviewing an application for approval of a Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) amendment, a rezoning to Planned Unit Development (PUD), a rezoning to a Zoning district other than PUD, a Preliminary Development Plan (PDP) or PDP amendment, and an Official Development Plan (ODP) or amendment. These criteria and standards are referred to in the Staff Reports and Agenda Memorandums brought before the City of Westminster Planning Commission and City Council on the land use applications described above.

Planning Division staff will be present at Monday night's Study Session to answer any questions City Council may have on these Criteria and Standards.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager

Attachment

## Criteria and Standards for Land Use Applications

### *Comprehensive Land Use Plan Amendments*

- The owner/applicant has “the burden of proving that the requested amendment is in the public good and in compliance with the overall purpose and intent of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan...” (WMC 11-4-16(D.4)).
- Demonstrate that there is justification for the proposed change and that the Plan is in need of revision as proposed;
- Be in conformance with the overall purpose, intent, and policies of the Plan;
- Be compatible with the existing and surrounding land uses; and
- Not result in excessive detrimental impacts to the City’s existing or planned infrastructure systems, or the applicant must provide measures to mitigate such impacts to the satisfaction of the City (Page VI-5 of the CLUP).

### *Approval of PUD, PDP and Amendments to PDP*

11-5-14: STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS, PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLANS AND AMENDMENTS TO PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLANS: (2534)

(A) In reviewing an application for approval of a Planned Unit Development and its associated Preliminary Development Plan or an amended Preliminary Development Plan, the following criteria shall be considered:

1. The Planned Unit Development (P.U.D.) zoning and the proposed land uses therein are in conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan and all City Codes, ordinances, and policies.
2. The P.U.D. exhibits the application of sound, creative, innovative, and efficient planning principles.
3. Any exceptions from standard code requirements or limitations are warranted by virtue of design or special amenities incorporated in the development proposal and are clearly identified on the Preliminary Development Plan.
4. The P.U.D. is compatible and harmonious with existing public and private development in the surrounding area.
5. The P.U.D. provides for the protection of the development from potentially adverse surrounding influences and for the protection of the surrounding areas from potentially adverse influence from within the development.
6. The P.U.D. has no significant adverse impacts upon existing or future land uses nor upon the future development of the immediate area.
7. Streets, driveways, access points, and turning movements are designed in a manner that promotes safe, convenient, and free traffic flow on streets without interruptions and in a manner that creates minimum hazards for vehicles and pedestrian traffic.
8. The City may require rights-of-way adjacent to existing or proposed arterial or collector streets, any easements for public utilities and any other public lands to be dedicated to the City as a condition to approving the PDP. Nothing herein shall preclude further public land dedications as a condition to ODP or plat approvals by the City.

9. Existing and proposed utility systems and storm drainage facilities are adequate to serve the development and are in conformance with overall master plans.
10. Performance standards are included that insure reasonable expectations of future Official Development Plans being able to meet the Standards for Approval of an Official Development Plan contained in section 11-5-15.
11. The applicant is not in default or does not have any outstanding obligations to the City.

(B) Failure to meet any of the above-listed standards may be grounds for denial of an application for Planned Unit Development zoning, a Preliminary Development Plan or an amendment to a Preliminary Development Plan.

***Zoning or Rezoning to a Zoning District Other Than a Planned Unit Development***

11-5-3: STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF ZONINGS AND REZONINGS: (2534)

(A) The following criteria shall be considered in the approval of any application for zoning or rezoning to a zoning district other than a Planned Unit Development:

1. The proposed zoning or rezoning is in conformance with the City's Comprehensive Plan and all City policies, standards and sound planning principles and practice.
2. There is either existing capacity in the City's street, drainage and utility systems to accommodate the proposed zoning or rezoning, or arrangements have been made to provide such capacity in a manner and timeframe acceptable to City Council.

***City Initiated Rezoning***

(B) The City may initiate a rezoning of any property in the City without the consent of the property owner, including property annexed or being annexed to the City, when City Council determines, as part of the final rezoning ordinance, any of the following:

1. The current zoning is inconsistent with one or more of the goals or objectives of the City's Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
2. The current zoning is incompatible with one or more of the surrounding land uses, either existing or approved.
3. The surrounding development is or may be adversely impacted by the current zoning.
4. The City's water, sewer or other services are or would be significantly and negatively impacted by the current zoning and the property is not currently being served by the City.

***ODP Application***

11-5-15: STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS AND AMENDMENTS TO OFFICIAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS: (2534)

(A) In reviewing an application for the approval of an Official Development Plan or amended Official Development Plan the following criteria shall be considered:

1. The plan is in conformance with all City Codes, ordinances, and policies.

2. The plan is in conformance with an approved Preliminary Development Plan or the provisions of the applicable zoning district if other than Planned Unit Development (PUD).
3. The plan exhibits the application of sound, creative, innovative, or efficient planning and design principles.
4. For Planned Unit Developments, any exceptions from standard code requirements or limitations are warranted by virtue of design or special amenities incorporated in the development proposal and are clearly identified on the Official Development Plan.
5. The plan is compatible and harmonious with existing public and private development in the surrounding area.
6. The plan provides for the protection of the development from potentially adverse surrounding influences and for the protection of the surrounding areas from potentially adverse influence from within the development.
7. The plan has no significant adverse impacts on future land uses and future development of the immediate area.
8. The plan provides for the safe, convenient, and harmonious grouping of structures, uses, and facilities and for the appropriate relation of space to intended use and structural features.
9. Building height, bulk, setbacks, lot size, and lot coverages are in accordance with sound design principles and practice.
10. The architectural design of all structures is internally and externally compatible in terms of shape, color, texture, forms, and materials.
11. Fences, walls, and vegetative screening are provided where needed and as appropriate to screen undesirable views, lighting, noise, or other environmental effects attributable to the development.
12. Landscaping is in conformance with City Code requirements and City policies and is adequate and appropriate.
13. Existing and proposed streets are suitable and adequate to carry the traffic within the development and its surrounding vicinity.
14. Streets, parking areas, driveways, access points, and turning movements are designed in a manner promotes safe, convenient, promotes free traffic flow on streets without interruptions and in a manner that creates minimum hazards for vehicles and or pedestrian traffic.
15. Pedestrian movement is designed in a manner that forms a logical, safe, and convenient system between all structures and off-site destinations likely to attract substantial pedestrian traffic.
16. Existing and proposed utility systems and storm drainage facilities are adequate to serve the development and are in conformance with the Preliminary Development Plans and utility master plans.
17. The applicant is not in default or does not have any outstanding obligations to the City.

(B) Failure to meet any of the above-listed standards may be grounds for denial of an Official Development Plan or an amendment to an Official Development Plan.



WESTMINSTER

Staff Report

Information Only Staff Report
May 16, 2005



SUBJECT: Monthly Residential Development Report

PREPARED BY: Shannon Sweeney, Planning Coordinator

Summary Statement:

This report is for City Council information only and requires no action by City Council.

- The following report updates 2005 residential development activity per subdivision (please see attachment) and compares 2005 year-to-date unit totals with 2004 year-to-date figures through the month of April.
The table below shows an overall decrease (-61.9%) in new residential construction for 2005 year-to-date compared to 2004 year-to-date totals.
Residential development activity so far in 2005 reflects decreases in single-family detached (-48.6%), single-family attached (-77.2%), and multi-family and no change in senior housing development when compared to last year at this time.

NEW RESIDENTIAL UNITS (2004 AND 2005)

Table with 7 columns: UNIT TYPE, APRIL (2004, 2005), % CHG., YEAR-TO-DATE (2004, 2005), % CHG. Rows include Single-Family Detached, Single-Family Attached, Multiple-Family, Senior Housing, and TOTAL.

**Background Information**

In April 2005, service commitments were issued for 14 new housing units within the subdivisions listed on the attached table. There were a total of 14 single-family detached and no single-family attached, multi-family, or senior housing building permits issued in April.

The column labeled “# Rem.” on the attached table shows the number of approved units remaining to be built in each subdivision.

Total numbers in this column increase as new residential projects (awarded service commitments in the new residential competitions), Legacy Ridge projects, build-out developments, etc. receive Official Development Plan (ODP) approval and are added to the list.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager

Attachment



**ACTIVE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

<b><u>Single-Family Detached Projects:</u></b>	<b>Mar-05</b>	<b>Apr-05</b>	<b>2004 YTD</b>	<b>2005 YTD</b>	<b># Rem.*</b>	<b>2004 Total</b>
Asbury Park III (94th & Teller)	0	0	0	0	0	1
Asbury Acres (94th & Wadsworth Bl.)	1	0	0	2	2	2
Bradburn (120th & Tennyson)	1	9	11	12	131	51
CedarBridge (111th & Bryant)	0	0	4	0	6	4
Covenant (115th & Sheridan)	0	0	6	0	0	6
Hazelwood Annexation (147th & Huron)	0	0	1	0	0	1
Huntington Trails (144th & Huron)	0	0	0	0	210	0
Legacy Ridge (108th & Leg. Ridge Pky.)	0	0	0	0	2	0
Legacy Ridge West (104th & Leg. Ridge Pky.)	18	1	71	33	21	152
Lexington (140th & Huron)	0	0	0	0	5	0
Maple Place (75th & Stuart)	0	0	4	0	0	4
Meadow View (107th & Simms)	0	0	1	2	12	6
Quail Crossing (136th & Kalamath)	0	0	9	0	0	9
Ranch Reserve (114th & Federal)	0	1	1	1	2	3
Ranch Reserve II (114th & Federal)	0	0	2	0	9	15
Ranch Reserve III (112th & Federal)	0	0	3	0	1	10
Savory Farm (112th & Federal)	0	0	4	0	0	4
Various Infill	0	0	1	0	11	3
Village at Harmony Park (128th & Zuni)	10	3	17	22	101	79
Wadsworth Estates (94th & Wads. Blvd.)	0	0	5	0	1	5
Winters Property (111th & Wads. Blvd.)	0	0	0	0	8	0
Winters Property South (110th & Wads. Blvd.)	0	0	0	0	10	0
<b><i>SUBTOTAL</i></b>	<b>30</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>355</b>
<b><u>Single-Family Attached Projects:</u></b>						
Alpine Vista (88th & Lowell)	0	0	0	0	84	0
Bradburn (120th & Tennyson)	0	0	43	18	55	92
CedarBridge (111th & Bryant)	0	0	0	0	2	0
Cottonwood Village (88th & Federal)	0	0	10	0	72	10
East Bradburn (120th & Lowell)	0	0	0	0	117	0
Highlands at Westbury (112th & Pecos)	0	0	0	0	96	75
Hollypark (96th & Federal)	0	0	0	0	20	0
Legacy Ridge West (112th & Leg. Ridge Pky.)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Legacy Village (113th & Sheridan)	0	0	0	0	94	0
Ranch Creek Villas (120th & Federal)	0	0	16	0	0	32
Summit Pointe (W. of Zuni at 82nd Pl.)	0	0	0	0	58	4
Sunstream (93rd & Lark Bunting)	0	0	0	0	24	4
Walnut Grove (108th & Wadsworth)	0	0	10	0	0	30
<b><i>SUBTOTAL</i></b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>247</b>
<b><u>Multiple-Family Projects:</u></b>						
Bradburn (120th & Tennyson)	0	0	0	0	54	0
Prospector's Point (87th & Decatur)	0	0	17	0	29	17
South Westminster (East Bay)	0	0	0	0	64	0
South Westminster (Harris Park Sites I-IV)	0	0	0	0	12	27
<b><i>SUBTOTAL</i></b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>44</b>
<b><u>Senior Housing Projects:</u></b>						
Covenant Retirement Village	0	0	0	0	32	0
Crystal Lakes (San Marino)	0	0	0	0	7	0
<b><i>SUBTOTAL</i></b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL (all housing types)</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>236</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>1352</b>	<b>646</b>

\* This column refers to the number of approved units remaining to be built in each subdivision.



# WESTMINSTER

## Staff Report

Information Only Staff Report  
May 16, 2005



**SUBJECT:** Amendment Request to Denver Regional Council of Governments Metro Vision 2030 Plan

**PREPARED BY:** Terri Hamilton, Planner III

### **Summary Statement:**

This report is for City Council information only and requires no action by City Council.

City Staff has submitted an Amendment Request to the Metro Vision 2030 Plan to the Denver Regional Council of Governments (DRCOG).

### **Background Information**

In 2004, DRCOG approved the Metro Vision 2030 Plan. This plan is a regional planning tool to help the region address future concerns related to projected growth. The population of the Denver region is expected to increase by nearly 50 percent, from 2.5 million to 3.8 million persons, by the year 2030. The Metro Vision 2030 Plan addresses numerous quality of life issues affected by population growth such as traffic congestion, air quality, water supply and quality, new or increased facilities and services (roads, water and sewer, drainage, schools, police and fire, etc.), and preservation of parks and open space.

The Metro Vision Plan will be updated periodically by DRCOG. DRCOG has established an amendment process and requirements for local governments to follow when submitting for an amendment. Upon previous direction from City Council, City Staff re-evaluated DRCOG criteria for the designation of urban centers (locations of concentrated employment and residential development based upon DRCOG requirements). Based upon re-evaluation, City Staff has submitted an amendment to DRCOG to the Metro Vision 2030 Plan for five proposed urban centers located within Westminster. These locations are as follows: North I-25, West 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Westminster Promenade, Westminster City Center, and South Westminster. A map attached to this staff report indicates the five proposed urban center locations.

Detailed analysis of these five locations by City Staff, along with conversations with DRCOG Staff, has led City Staff to believe approval of this amendment is highly probable. Formal assessment and approval by DRCOG is scheduled to occur over the summer and fall, with final approvals by DRCOG no later than November of 2005. City Staff will then inform City Council as to the outcome of the proposed amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Brent McFall  
City Manager

Attachment

- Map of Urban Centers