City of Louisville
COLORADO • SINCE 1878

City Council

January 6, 2026
Packet Addendum #1

From:	Mark Gasper
To:	City Council
Subject:	Opposition to Coal Creek Village PUD as Submitted
Date:	Saturday, January 3, 2026 11:01:44 AM
Attachments:	Coal Creek Village - Gasper Letter to City Council.pdf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] From outside of City of Louisville DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe.

Mark & Donna Gasper
1014 Johnson Lane
Louisville, CO 80027
January 3, 2026

Louisville City Council
749 Main Street
Louisville, CO 80027

RE: Opposition to Coal Creek Village PUD as Submitted

Dear City Council,
I am writing to formally express my opposition to the Coal Creek Village PUD as currently submitted. The proposed development represents a substantial increase in density compared to prior plans, and it raises serious transportation and safety concerns that have not been adequately addressed—particularly related to the proposed connection of Front Street to Griffith Street.

This connection would funnel significant new traffic through an already constrained and sensitive area. The intersection of Front and Griffith is a known bottleneck, complicated by a railroad crossing and its proximity to Louisville Middle School. Increasing traffic through this corridor threatens the safety of students, pedestrians, cyclists, and residents of nearby neighborhoods including Little Italy, the DELO Townhomes, and DELO Apartments.
What's most troubling is that this critical intersection was not included in the traffic study for the proposed PUD. The recent city investments in quieter train crossings at this location were made with current traffic volumes in mind—not with the expectation of routing thousands of additional vehicles per day through this corridor.
We are kidding ourselves if we believe that "traffic calming features" will meaningfully mitigate the resulting safety and congestion issues. These features are no substitute for comprehensive transportation planning, and they do not resolve the fundamental mismatch between this development's scale and the infrastructure it will rely on.

Furthermore, every recent and relevant city planning document either opposes or omits the proposed Front–Griffith connection:

- Transportation Master Plan (2019)
- Historic Preservation Plan (2015)
- South Boulder Road Connectivity Plan (2019)
- Future42 Plan (2022)

In contrast, the only documents that support this connection are either outdated or pre-date significant changes in the surrounding area, including:

- **2003** Highway 42 Revitalization Plan (now replaced by Future42)
- **2016** Coal Creek Station Plan (only 56 units; pre-dates DELO and TMP 2019)
- Caledonia Place Plat (**1890**)
- Coal Creek Station Filing (**1978**)

It is inappropriate to rely on these outdated documents to justify a high-density development that contradicts current plans and realities.

Beyond safety, the proposed street connectivity simply does not work in practice:
Morning traffic: Residents attempting to head west on South Boulder Road will be unable to turn left, forcing them to detour through Little Italy narrow roads to reach Front Street then travel across the train tracks past Louisville Middle School and then the light at South Boulder—putting pressure on areas not designed for commuter traffic.
Evening traffic: Vehicles heading north on Hwy 42/Courtesy Road will be forced to turn left at the signal light at Short Street, travel through Delo Apartment complex and through Delo Townhomes to get to Front Street. These roads are narrow and were never meant for commuter traffic. In fact, Front Street is maintained by Delo Townhomes. This area was never intended to serve as a major vehicle corridor and retrofitting it for such use is ill-advised.

In summary, I urge the Planning Commission to reject the Coal Creek Village PUD in its current form. It introduces dangerous and unplanned traffic patterns, is inconsistent with every recent city planning document, and fails to adequately consider the safety and livability of adjacent neighborhoods and schools.

Thank you for your time and for considering the concerns of local residents.
Sincerely,
Mark & Donna Gasper
Markgasper61@gmail.com

From: Jack Rosenthal
To: City Council; Clerks Office
Subject: Written comment for tonight"s meeting - Jan 6 2026
Date: Tuesday, January 6, 2026 11:41:47 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] From outside of City of Louisville DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe.

Councilmembers,

I would like to submit a written public comment for tonight's meeting; I unfortunately cannot attend as there's an RTD board meeting at the same time.

Please note my support for tonight's Resolution #6 ("A RESOLUTION ENCOURAGING THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT TO COMPLETE THE NORTHWEST RAIL CORRIDOR PROJECT"). We have a ways to go with support on the current RTD board, and this sets the right message from the City of Louisville.

Thank you,

Jack Rosenthal
Candidate for RTD Board of Directors, District O
(720) 789-3676
jackforrtd.com

From:	Mario Jannatpour
To:	City Council
Subject:	RESOLUTION NO. 1, SERIES 2026 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING AN AGREEMENT FOR THE CONVERSION OF THE INLINE SKATING RINK TO DEDICATED PICKLEBALL COURTS
Date:	Tuesday, January 6, 2026 8:31:37 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] From outside of City of Louisville DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you validate the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello City Council Members! I just found out late last night about this topic for your meeting tonight.

Here are my thoughts:

1. Should be 4 courts instead of 5. Overall that will reduce noise and improve play quality. Waneka Lake has four courts and it works fine.
2. The pickleglass should surround the entire court at a decent height. The south side should have same height as north side.
3. I think I see no barriers on the east and west sides of the court complex, need some kind of barrier to prevent balls from going off courts.
4. Is pickleglass safe? I know players are always running into the side and end barriers.
5. What are the options going forward if we can still hear the sound of balls hitting paddles at our house on Cherrywood Lane?
6. I still feel there will not be enough parking spots there to accommodate players coming to play. You don't want players parking in neighborhood streets. Maybe consider a new parking lot west of the skate park and east of the police station. Overflow parking at the rec center is not an option because it's usually full.
7. Big picture, this will reduce the quality of life at the Arboretum. Isn't there a place to build a new court complex in Red Tail Ridge development?

Mario Jannatpour