

January 14, 2022

Debbie Flynn  
Planner  
Town of Monument  
Monument Town Hall  
645 Beacon Lite Road  
Monument, CO 80132

**RE: Conexus Business Park Phases 2 & 3 Preliminary PUD Plan  
Response to First Comment Letter**

Dear Ms. Flynn,

This letter responds to your December 23, 2021 review letter for the subject project. Responses to review comments are shown in **RED** below.

Bob Swatek, Utility Construction Planner – Black Hills Energy  
719-332-5856, [bob.swatek@blackhillscorp.com](mailto:bob.swatek@blackhillscorp.com)

No comments received as of date of the letter. Any future comments provided will be forwarded to the applicant.

**RESPONSE: Noted**

Valerie Sword, Permit Unit Manager – Colorado Department of Transportation  
[valerie.sword@state.co.us](mailto:valerie.sword@state.co.us)

#### Traffic & Safety

The Traffic Impact Study dated 11/19/2021, has been reviewed by the CDOT Traffic Engineer Team for review their comments are as follows:

- It is estimated from the report's contents that 6600 trips will be generated through the intersection of Baptist Rd & Terrazzo Drive. The existing ADT of Baptist Rd is indicated as 10,300 vehicles per day. A State Highway Access Permit is required for the change in use per State Highway Access Code §2.6(3).  
**RESPONSE: The intersection of Baptist/Terrazzo has been added to the TIS. The applicant intends to initiate the access permit process shortly, but requests that CDOT review the TIA and provide a response to indicate if deemed "acceptable".**
- The report indicates that 4600 trips will be generated through the intersection of 2nd St & Hwy 105/I-25 SB Ramps. The existing ADT of 2nd St is indicated as 7920 vehicles per day. A State Highway Access Permit is required for the change in use per State Highway Access Code §2.6(3)  
**RESPONSE: This intersection has been added to the TIS.**

- The study area should be expanded to where newly generated site traffic represents 5 percent or more of roadway's peak hour capacity, (SHAC 2.3(5)(b)). This would include the intersection of Baptist Rd with Terrazzo Drive and the intersection of Second St with Hwy 105 & I-25 SB ramps. The intersection of Second St with Hwy 105 & I-25 SB ramps is of particular interest due to the limited queuing capacity along Second St.

**RESPONSE:** This intersection has been added to the TIS.

#### Access

- CDOT will require an access permit for each proposed access point for change in use of the property once all the previous comments have been addressed and are acceptable to the Department.

**RESPONSE:** The intersection of Baptist/Terrazzo has been added to the TIS. The applicant intends to initiate the access permit process shortly, but requests that CDOT review the TIA and provide a response to indicate if deemed "acceptable".

Jason Meyer, Planning Supervisor – El Paso County Community Services Department (Parks)  
719-520-6985, [jasonmeyer@elpasoco.com](mailto:jasonmeyer@elpasoco.com)

No comments received as of date of the letter. Any future comments provided will be forwarded to the applicant.

**RESPONSE:** Developer will meet with County Parks Department to discuss impact on the trail from the proposed realignment of Old Denver Road.

John Merritt, P.E., Transportation Manager, HR Green Consultant to Triview Metropolitan District  
719-213-4893, [john.adc.co@gmail.com](mailto:john.adc.co@gmail.com)

No comments received as of date of the letter. Any future comments provided will be forwarded to the applicant.

**RESPONSE:** The Developer has been involved in ongoing discussion with Triview Consultant regarding the realignment of Old Denver Road.

Jamey Bumgarner, Fire Marshal - Tri-Lakes Monument Fire Protection District  
719-484-0911, [jbumgarner@tlmfire.org](mailto:jbumgarner@tlmfire.org)

No comments received as of date of the letter. Any future comments provided will be forwarded to the applicant.

**RESPONSE:** Noted

Corey D. Adler, District Wildlife Manger – Colorado Springs/Northwest El Paso County  
719-439-9637, [corey.adler@state.co.us](mailto:corey.adler@state.co.us)

See attached letter.

#### **RESPONSES:**

- The Plan identifies the PMJM habitat and the proposed development does not impact the habitat areas. The realignment of Old Denver Road may have some minor impact on PMJM habitat and a mitigation plan will be provided to USFWS during the construction phase.

- The developer will follow standard procedures for prairie dog and burrowing owl habitats prior to and during development.
- The development will detain stormwater on the site and release at historic rates. USAFA are a review agency for the project.
- The recommendations of the Noxious Weed Management Plan will be adhered to by the developer.
- The recommendations of the Wildlife Impact Identification Report will be adhered to by the developer.

Elizabeth (Beth) Dukes, Community Planner - Department of the Air Force 10<sup>th</sup> Civil Engineer Squadron  
[elizabeth.dukes.3.ctr@us.af.mil](mailto:elizabeth.dukes.3.ctr@us.af.mil)

See attached letter.

**RESPONSES:**

- Please reference the MDDP included with the resubmittal. The development will detain stormwater on the site via a full-spectrum detention pond and stormwater will be released at historic rates with appropriate dissipation as to minimize downstream impact. The MDDP addresses the downstream impact.
- A detailed drainage report and details of the proposed full spectrum detention ponds will be included with the Final Plat/Final PUD Plans.
- A copy of the recorded avigation easement will be provided to USAFA.
- FAA project review will be undertaken with Final PUD Plans.

Drue DeBerry, Colorado and Nebraska Field Supervisor – US Fish and Wildlife Service  
[coloradoes@fws.gov](mailto:coloradoes@fws.gov)

See attached letter.

**RESPONSES:**

- The Plan identifies the PMJM habitat and the proposed development does not impact the habitat areas. The northern open space tract will be dedicated to the Town of Monument. Recreational trails, by the Town of Monument, in this area will be designed to minimize impact to the PMJM habitat. The realignment of Old Denver Road may have some minor impact on PMJM habitat and a mitigation plan will be provided to USFWS during the construction phase.
- Please reference the MDDP included with the resubmittal. The development will detain stormwater on the site via a full-spectrum detention pond and stormwater will be released at historic rates with appropriate dissipation as to minimize downstream impact. The MDDP addresses the downstream impact.

Kylie Bagley, Planner II - El Paso County Planning & Community Development Department – Planning Division

719-520-6323, [kyliebagley@elpasoco.com](mailto:kyliebagley@elpasoco.com)

Gilbert LaForce, PE, [gilbertlaforce@elpasoco.com](mailto:gilbertlaforce@elpasoco.com)

PCD Engineering review comments:

Drainage: 1. No comments. The development is planned to include on-site detention designed to release at historic rates. No adverse effect to downstream properties within unincorporated El Paso County is anticipated.

**RESPONSE: Noted**

Bob Foster, Director of Personnel & Student Services at Lewis-Palmer - Lewis-Palmer School District 38  
719-488-4700, [rfoster@lewispalmer.org](mailto:rfoster@lewispalmer.org)

LPSD asks for fees in lieu per residential unit at time of building permit.

**RESPONSE: Noted**

Justin Annan, GIS Analyst – El Paso-Teller County 9-1-1 Authority  
719-785-1900, [jannan@elpasoteller911.org](mailto:jannan@elpasoteller911.org)

Crossfield Dr – Available.

Sante Fe Trail – Previously Approved.

Conexus Way – Previously Approved.

**RESPONSE: Noted**

Terri Hayes, President & CEO – Tri-Lakes Chamber of Commerce & EDC  
719-481-3282, [terri@trilakeschamber.com](mailto:terri@trilakeschamber.com)

No comments.

**RESPONSE: Noted**

Nick Harris, JDS-Hydro - TriView Metropolitan District 's water consultant  
719-227-0072, Ext 115, [nharris@jdshydro.com](mailto:nharris@jdshydro.com)

1. The connection of the proposed development's water system to the existing water infrastructure on the south end of the development will require a pressure-reducing valve and associated appurtenances.

**RESPONSE: Noted**

2. The Master Facility Plan references a 16" waterline by others. The District wishes to work with the Developer to ensure the design and easements for this 16" waterline are integrated into this development. Additionally, planning and easements for a water system interconnection with the Town of Monument located along the western edge of the development.

**RESPONSE: Noted. The developer will work with Triview on the waterline design and easement.**

3. The District understands the preliminary nature of the PUD, but additional water and sewer looping may be necessary. The District will work with the Developer to determine looping needs as more detailed plans become available.

**RESPONSE: Noted. The developer will work with Triview to determine water looping needs.**

Gina Perry, Engineering Coordinator II – Mountain View Electric Association, Inc.  
719-494-2636, [Gina.P@mvea.coop](mailto:Gina.P@mvea.coop)

1. This area is within the Association's certificated service area. The Association will serve this area according to our Line Extension policy. Connection requirements may include provisions for necessary line extensions and or other system improvements, and payment of all fees under the

Association’s Line Extension Policy. Information concerning these requirements can be obtained by contacting the Engineering Department.

**RESPONSE: Noted.**

2. The Association requests a ten (10) foot front, side, and rear lot utility easement on the plat along with a twenty (20) foot exterior utility easement. The Association also requests the platting of the existing facilities with easements on the plat. Additional easements may be required.

**RESPONSE: Noted. Will be addressed with future Plats.**

3. If open space, drainage and landscape tracts are designed in this development the Association requests these areas be listed to include utilities. Additional easements may be required once a review of civil drawings with grading and erosion plan is provided to the Association in order to serve.

**RESPONSE: Utilities added to allowed uses in open space tracts. Please note that some of these tracts include Preble’s Jumping Mouse Habitat which cannot be disturbed for utilities.**

4. The Association has existing facilities near and within this parcel of land. If there is any damage, removal or relocation of facilities it will be at the expense of the applicant.

**RESPONSE: Noted.**

Amy Vanderbeek, Enumerations Plans Examiner – Pikes Peak Regional Building Department

719-327-2930, [amy@pprbd.org](mailto:amy@pprbd.org)

1. Again, for assignment of addressing for lots and tracts, place addressing marker (xxx) where they are intended to be utilized. Addressing marker for lots should be front door.

**RESPONSE: Addressing markers will be included with future plats.**

2. Once the PUD is approved please contact Enumerations to place the project on a list to be addressed.

No further comments at this time.

**RESPONSE: Noted.**

Keith Curtis, Floodplain Administrator – Pikes Peak Regional Building Department

719-327-2898, [keith@pprbd.org](mailto:keith@pprbd.org)

1. The approach outlined in the PRELIMINARY DRAINAGE LETTER FOR CONEXUS PHASES 2 AND 3 is acceptable.

2. Add the below note to all plans and plats moving forward:

*“FLOODPLAIN STATEMENT According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panels #08041C0278 G, dated December 7, 2019, 100-year flood plains exist just to the north and south of the proposed development (See Appendix). Note that it is the intent of this development to stay out of the floodplain limits.”*

**RESPONSE: Floodplain note revised to reflect this wording.**

Virginia Ortiz – Jacobs (on behalf of the Town of Monument engineering review)

### **Preliminary PUD Plan Comments**

Sheet 1:

The number of residential units in the land use chart does not match what is analyzed in the traffic report. Please make sure in the final site plans that these match.

**RESPONSE:** The numbers on the Preliminary Plan are correct and the traffic report has been revised accordingly.

Indicate pavement thickness on the Local Type II cross section to support industrial traffic. Also note that 15' travel lanes are required for a Local Type II.

**RESPONSE:** Plans revised and this road type has been deleted

Sheet 5:

It's unclear if the sections of sewer line perpendicular to the main line are the same diameter as the main line. Consider adding additional callouts.

**RESPONSE:** Plans revised. Sizing will be finalized at the time of Final Design.

Should there be a proposed sanitary line along the proposed spine road for the high density residential?

**RESPONSE:** Plans revised. A sewer line is proposed in the realigned Old Denver Road.

**Drainage Letter Comments:**

1. The proposed development does not appear to meet the criteria for use of the "Drainage Letter" report format (DCM Vol. 1, Chapter 4, Section 2.5) and should follow the criteria for a Master Development Drainage Plan (MDDP) (DCM Vol. 1, Chapter 4, Figure 4-1.).  
**RESPONSE:** MDDP is submitted and follows the criteria.
2. The Drainage Letter and various reports included with the Preliminary PUD submittal provide much of the content required in a MDDP (DCM Vol. 1, Chapter 4, Exhibit 4-2). All relevant information in these documents should be consolidated into the MDDP.  
**RESPONSE:** MDDP included in submittal
3. It is not clear whether a Drainage Basin Planning Study (DBPS) has been previously prepared for the basin(s) including this development site. This should be addressed in the MDDP.  
**RESPONSE:** Included in MDDP
4. According to the Figure 4-1 flow chart, the MDDP will need to be approved prior to approval of a Preliminary Drainage Report (PDR), and a PDR is a requirement of Preliminary PUD approval. PDR guidelines appear in DCM Vol. 1, Chapter 4, Exhibit 4-3.  
**RESPONSE:** An MDDP has been requested by the reviewing agencies and is now a part of this resubmittal. Preliminary Drainage Reports will be done moving forward for each of the internal developments as they come in for review.
5. It appears that at least one culvert under I-25 conveys water onto the development site from the east. Means for conveyance and management of off-site runoff should be described in the MDDP.  
**RESPONSE:** We believe it's the intent of CDOT to have all drainage convey along its western roadside ditch. If it's determined that this is not occurring, it is likely due to their facilities requiring some maintenance and they will be informed as such.
6. The Wildlife Impact Identification Report includes information pertaining to Waters of the U.S. (WOTUS); however, it is not clear if and how South Pond grading might impact WOTUS. Topo plans indicate at least one well-defined tributary running through the pond footprint. All potential impacts should be addressed in the MDDP.  
**RESPONSE:** Recommend that WOTUS and wetland determination be addressed at the Preliminary/final drainage report phase for the south detention pond along with any mitigative efforts.

### Traffic Report Comments

1. What was the purpose of conducting 2021 counts at 2nd & Beacon Lite? Why was there not the need to conduct new counts at Baptist/Old Denver? Or to adjust the volumes here to 2021? Was it due to age of relevant counts?  
**RESPONSE:** The traffic counts were updated at 2nd/Beacon Lite to determine if the intersection was approaching traffic-signal warrants based on the current conditions. The updated TIS includes updated traffic counts at Baptist/Old Denver. New counts were also conducted at 2<sup>nd</sup> Street/SH 105.
2. Were there any adjustments to 2020 collected counts (or 2021) for COVID?  
**RESPONSE:** No adjustments were made for the COVID-19 pandemic as by November 2021 traffic patterns have generally been observed to have returned to a more stable pattern.
3. Page 8 says that Table 2 shows pass-by trip percentages. This is not the case as Table 2 is LOS criteria on page 6. Please add table.  
**RESPONSE:** The text has been revised to note that the pass-by percentages are shown on Table 3.
4. Last paragraph on page 9 and page 11, report states that 2nd & Beacon Lite would operate at LOS C if signalized, which appears to be correct. Figure 11 shows LOS B in both peak hours. Please verify and revise.  
**RESPONSE:** All of the analysis has been updated based on the current land-use plan and figure 11 has been updated to show the intersection of 2<sup>nd</sup> & Beacon Lite is projected to operate at LOS C if signalized.
5. Page 10 and Page 12, report states that Old Denver & North Site Access westbound approach will operate at LOS F, but Figures 9 & 11 show it's the WBLT.  
**RESPONSE:** This comment is no longer applicable based on the current access plan with Old Denver Road realigned through the site.
6. Page 11, report states a ratio was used for off-peak volumes based on counts from November 2017. I believe this should be 2021. Please revise.  
**RESPONSE:** The traffic counts at Beacon Lite/2nd were only conducted during the peak hours in November 2021. LSC used off-peak traffic-count data from 2017 to estimate future off-peak volumes. The 2017 traffic-count data has been included in the appendix of the updated TIS.
7. Page 13, report describes deceleration lane elements and NR-B is referenced for Old Denver Rd. Information provide appears to be for decel. length and not taper + storage as indicated in SHAC. Please revise. Please include thoughts on storage lengths.  
**RESPONSE:** Revised as requested.
8. Figure 4, the WBTH AM volume (105 veh) at Baptist does not match the volumes shown on Figure 8. Please verify which number is correct, that it was analyzed properly, and revise as needed.  
**RESPONSE:** The background traffic volumes at Baptist have been revised based on traffic counts conducted in January 2022.
9. Figure 7 shows 8/17 pass-by trips for the WBRT. Please update to 2/6.  
**RESPONSE:** The trip assignment has been revised based on the updated land-use plan and the pass-by volumes shown on the site-generated traffic figure have been updated accordingly.
10. Figure 10, EBRT at south access shows 15 veh in AM when background shows 5 veh. Please verify which number is correct, that it was analyzed properly, and revise as needed.  
**RESPONSE:** This comment is no longer applicable based on the current access plan with Old Denver Road realigned through the site.

11. Figure 10, NBTH at Baptist Rd shows 31 veh in the AM. I think it should be 17 veh. Please verify which number is correct, that it was analyzed properly, and revise as needed.  
**RESPONSE: The background traffic volumes at Baptist have been revised based on traffic counts conducted in January 2022.**
12. Please add WB right-turn bypass lane symbol to Figure 11.  
**RESPONSE: Revised as requested.**
13. Short-term total synchro analysis sheets were not included in the report. Please included.  
**RESPONSE: All synchro analysis sheets are included in the updated TIS.**
14. Pages 71 & 80, long term AM and PM synchro analysis shows different lane configurations for WB approach. (Verify is this is the same for short-term.) Please correct.  
**RESPONSE: This comment is no longer applicable based on the current access plan with Old Denver Road realigned through the site.**
14. Page 54, please add cross street to header.  
**RESPONSE: This comment is no longer applicable based on the current access plan with Old Denver Road realigned through the site.**
15. There are a couple of mentions about half-build out. I'm not following what impact that has on the analysis and report. Please explain in response.  
**RESPONSE: All references to "half-build out" have been removed. All of the analysis is based on full buildout of the site.**
16. Town TIS requirements state that the report recommendations should identify who is responsible for constructing each required improvement. I'm particularly interested in the 2 proposed roundabouts on Old Denver at the site access points, since the other improvements were stated to have been discussed with the Town and Triview.  
**RESPONSE: The text has been revised as requested.**
17. Please add some text regarding the New Santa Fe Regional Trail.  
**RESPONSE: Additional text has been added as requested.**

Debbie Flynn, Planner II – Town of Monument

719-488-1604, [dflynn@tomgov.org](mailto:dflynn@tomgov.org)

*Through this review there have been many conversations related to the final design of Old Denver Road and how redesign will impact this submittal. It is staff's understanding that the applicant has agreed to a significant change to the Old Denver Road alignment and that will impact these comments. The resubmittal of the project narrative, traffic study, and plans should address the changes made to Old Denver Road and how the plans are impacted.*

### **Project Narrative**

1. Staff is willing to support additional residential dwelling units only with the reduction of the non-residential square footage. More discussion related to uses is under the plan review section below.  
**RESPONSE: Non-residential square footage has been reduced in resubmitted plans.**
2. Definitions in Chapter 18.07 of the Town's Municipal Codes defines multi-use as mixed-use.
  - a. *Mixed-Use* means the development of a lot, tract or parcel of land, building or structure with two or more different uses including, but not limited to, residential, office, retail, public uses, personal service or entertainment uses, designed, planned and constructed as a unit.



**RESPONSE:** The multi-use definition has been deleted and the PUD defers to the mixed-use definition in the code. However, per discussion with Town planning staff, it has been clarified that the word “unit” in the definition is defined as “a larger area of land made up of smaller units.”

3. Under Industrial Uses it states Chapter 18.04.160 (mobile home parks) of the Monument Municipal Code. Please revise to Chapter 18.04.150 (Industrial uses).

**RESPONSE:** Revised.

4. Under Architecture and Design:
  - a. Please include outdoor lighting requirements from Section 18.05.330 – approved fixtures of the Town’s Municipal Code will be adhered to.

**RESPONSE:** Added.

5. Under drainage, please revise Therse to These.

**RESPONSE:** Revised.

6. Under open space, please state that Conexus Phases 2 & 3 is in conformance with Section 18.05.140 – open space of the Town’s Municipal Code.

**RESPONSE:** Added.

7. Include areas devoted to open space and/or public land dedication and streets with calculations.

**RESPONSE:** A tract table has been added for clarification and this is also included in the Land Use table on the PUD Plan.

8. It is mentioned that Conexus Metropolitan District will maintain the tract to the north. Please state who will maintain the tract to the south. If dedicated to the Town, please state it within the project narrative.

**RESPONSE:** Added. Both tracts are now to be dedicated to the Town and will be maintained by the Town.

9. Under Consistency with the Monument Comprehensive Plan, please revise the Preliminary PUD Plan is content with these Comprehensive Plan objectives to consistent.

**RESPONSE:** Revised.

10. Under Consistency with Code Review Criteria:

- a. #2 states that future Final PUD Plans for residential development should include adequate amenity areas to serve future residents but are not required to provide additional open space or public parks. Town staff will determine if land or fees in-lieu is required when the Final PUD Plans are submitted.

**RESPONSE:** Noted.

- b. #7, Section 18.04.150 – Industrial uses states that the industrial component must have a minimum 50-foot-wide landscape buffer along any property line where an industrial use is adjacent to a less intense use or zone district. If an industrial use has already been established, then a buffer shall be provided within the new less intense development.
  - i. It is understood that there is a 45-foot utility easement and building setback between the multi-family and industrial uses. Please explain how a landscape buffer would be implemented (i.e., trail, tree line, etc.) between the two uses.

**RESPONSE:** This PUD Plan supersedes section 18.04.150 of the Code as stated within the Development standards. It is proposed to provide a 50-foot building to building setback minimum between adjacent industrial and residential uses within the PUD zone, which will incorporate a 15-foot minimum landscape buffer that will provide buffer planting as set out in the PUD landscape

standards. The 15-foot landscape buffer and associated planting could be on either the industrial or residential lot or staggered between the two.

### Traffic Impact Study

*These comments are based on the original submittal of the traffic study with the Preliminary PUD. The redesign of Old Denver Road will change the study significantly. Please consider these comments within the updated study.*

1. Any improvements required through the traffic study will be added to the plan notes and more specifically agreed to through a public improvement agreement.  
**RESPONSE: Noted.**
2. On page 4, please revise Willow Springs to Willow Springs Ranch.  
**RESPONSE: Revised as requested.**
3. On page 7, the future roadway connection onto Baptist Road is Willow Ranch Road. You may want to show the AWT volumes Jabil and Johnson and Johnson that currently takes 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and show these volumes on the future Willow Ranch Road to Baptist Road. This AWT volumes will eventually elevate traffic on 2<sup>nd</sup> Street.  
**RESPONSE: The background traffic volumes are consistent with the volumes shown in the Willow Springs Ranch Traffic Impact Study dated February 12, 2020, which assume the Willow Ranch Road connection.**
4. The total number of residential units (544) does not match the proposed 788 units on the Preliminary PUD.  
**RESPONSE: The land use has been revised in the updated TIS.**
5. The total square footage for non-residential does not match the proposed SQFT on the Preliminary PUD.  
**RESPONSE: The land use has been revised in the updated TIS.**
6. Table 3 – Trip Generation Estimate has the wrong footnote number for average weekday traffic.  
**RESPONSE: The table has been revised.**
7. Please only provide the November 2021 traffic count numbers in all figures and tables.  
**RESPONSE: Revised as requested.**
8. The TIS recommends that the interim design will provide southbound left turn lanes and northbound right-turn lanes at each access point on Old Denver Road. What phase of construction/land use will the interim design be implemented? Will it be able to accommodate the average weekday traffic? This design may not be acceptable at any phase of Conexus. If so, Old Denver Road improvements will need to be completed concurrently with all phases of Conexus Phases 2 & 3.  
**RESPONSE: This comment is no longer applicable based on the current access plan with Old Denver Road realigned through the site. The updated TIS includes recommendations for the currently proposed realigned section of Old Denver Road.**
9. If the applicant decides not to include roundabouts at each access point, the TIS will require changes when the spine road and/or Old Denver Road design is completed.  
**RESPONSE: This comment is no longer applicable based on the current access plan with Old Denver Road realigned through the site.**

### Drainage Letter

A similar drainage letter was submitted in June 2021 for the Conexus Phase 2&3 Sketch Plan. That drainage letter stated that three detention basins were required. The similar drainage submittal prepared by JR Engineering and dated November 2021 states that only 2 detention basins are required. Why is this? Is this driven by the previous letter impervious estimate at 80% vs the 2021 letter estimate of 70%?

**RESPONSE:** The number of ponds reducing from 3 to 2 was primarily due to rearranging the land uses across phases 2/3.

### Conexus Business Park Phases 2 & 3 Preliminary PUD Plan

*Cover Sheet (Page 1):*

1. Add a note referencing the findings of the traffic study and the date of the traffic study. This should also include any described off-site improvements required and a statement that a public improvement agreement will be required prior to recordation of any final plats. The future public improvement agreement will further define timing and infrastructure responsibilities.

**RESPONSE:** Added.

2. Local Type II Collector is not a road classification in the Town's Roadway Design and Technical Criteria. Please revise to Local Type II Commercial.

3. **RESPONSE:** Removed based on proposed change to Old Denver Road alignment.

4. Please change the Planning Manager to Planning Director under the Planning Department Certification signature block.

**RESPONSE:** Revised.

5. Under General Notes:

- a. Please revise #8 to state Final PUD Plan.

**RESPONSE:** revised.

- b. Note #6 may not apply if the use develops as residential. Is this note needed on the preliminary plan? Can it be modified to be more specific?

**RESPONSE:** Removed.

- c. Note #9, Town Staff will determine if additional open space or public parks are required per future Final PUD Plans. Determination of ultimate ownership of Tract E and any dedication credit needs to be determined.

**RESPONSE:** This Preliminary PUD Plan meets the PUD open space requirements and additional provision of open space for individual Final PUD Plans should not be required irrespective of who owns the open space tracts. Tract E will be dedicated to the town, and this is clarified on the plan. It is acknowledged that Park Fees in lieu of park land dedication may be due with residential development.

- d. Please include the following from the approved PD Sketch Plan:

- i. For residential uses, park and school land dedication or fees in lieu of land will be required at the time of Final Plat recording.

**RESPONSE:** Added.

- ii. The Conexus Business Park Phases 2 & 3 Preliminary PUD Plan will be subject to the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between El Paso County and Conexus LLC, which permits up to six crossings of the New Santa Fe Regional Trail...

**RESPONSE: Added.**

- iii. The Conexus Property Owners Association will act as the Architectural Control Committee for building architecture. The Conexus Property Owners Association will maintain all entry signs.

**RESPONSE: Added but revised to the Conexus Metropolitan District rather than the POA.**

- e. Please add the following to Note #8, detail sheet, photometric, and irrigation plans.

**RESPONSE: Added.**

- f. Please add a note stating that a noise study will be required at the Final PUD Plan submittal for the multi-family use.

**RESPONSE: Added.**

6. Site Data:

- a. Please state the existing use as vacant.

**RESPONSE: Revised.**

- b. Please include the Site Standards:

- i. Include specifications for minimum lot area, minimum setbacks, maximum building height, maximum lot coverage and any other proposed bulk and area standards.

**RESPONSE: These are already included in the Development Standards.**

- ii. Add a note that residential lot coverage and other setbacks specific to single-family will be determined at Final PUD plan.

**RESPONSE: This is already addressed in the Development Standards.**

- iii. Include areas devoted to open space and/or public land dedication and streets.

**RESPONSE: This is already included in the Land Use table.**

7. Land Use Chart:

- a. Elaborate on the industrial use in the land use chart. For example, provide the maximum square footage of the use and an overall reduction of the maximum non-residential square footage. There should be more definition of how the non-residential will be allocated along with a reduction of non-residential square footage to offset the additional residential units.

**RESPONSE: Addressed. Non-residential land use has been reduced proportionally to the proposed increase in residential land use.**

- b. Maximum number of residential units does not match the approved PD Sketch Plan (the traffic study does not use these numbers).

- i. Approved PD Sketch Plan = 465 units

- 1. Medium-Density Residential: 6-12 du/ac
- 2. High-Density Residential: 12-20 du/ac

- ii. Proposed Preliminary PUD Plan = 788 units

- 1. The Medium-Density Residential does match the approved 6-12 dwelling units per acre.
- 2. The High-Density Residential (12-25 du/ac) does not match the approved density at 12-20 dwelling units per acre. Please revise that the maximum density is 12-20 dwelling units per acre as approved via the sketch plan.

**RESPONSE: An increase in residential use on the site is being requested as a result of feedback from the neighboring residents. A proportional reduction in the non-residential square footage is now proposed. The Medium-Density Residential is now capped at 10**

du/ac which is consistent with the Sketch Plan. The High-Density Residential is now capped at 20.89 du/ac, which is only slightly higher than the Sketch Plan density range.

- c. Staff will consider additional residential units with a reduction of the non-residential component of the PUD. Maximum land uses were calculated on the gross acreage but infrastructure, setbacks, parking, ect. will reduce the number of units that can be accommodated. Residential maximums should be reduced to closer reflect the true net capacity.

**RESPONSE:** A proportional reduction in the non-residential square footage is now proposed. Density is always calculated on a gross basis. The Medium- Density Residential is now capped at 10 du/ac and the High-Density Residential is now capped at 20.89 du/ac, which are considered realistic densities for this type of use.

- d. The maximum of 475 units on Lot 1 is not realistic given setbacks, parking, and landscaping. Consider appropriate revisions to lower the multi-family unit cap.

**RESPONSE:** The density of the high-density residential has been reduced to 20.89 du/ac or 399 units.

- e. Add clarification to the chart or a more specific note that explains Lot 3 and Lot 5 are either residential or commercial. The way the chart currently reads is both the maximum residential and non-residential (combined) would be permitted. It appears the intent is one use or the other, which would reduce the number of residential lots or non-residential. This clarification is needed to set the maximum residential units versus non-residential square footage for the development.

**RESPONSE:** These lots have been converted to residential only due to the proposed realignment of Old Denver Road.

- f. The approved PD Sketch Plan states that there will be open space, park, and trails. Please include these uses in the Land Use Chart.

**RESPONSE:** Added as appropriate.

*Zoning Regulations & Development Guidelines (Page 2):*

8. Number 2, Permitted Uses:

- a. Staff recommends removing the following uses:
  - i. Vehicle parking lot
  - ii. Outdoor storage (as a principal use), state this land use as an accessory use.
  - iii. Transit center
  - iv. Solar energy system, all categories – or clarify the intent of pulling this forward from the Land Development Code as roof-top solar.

**RESPONSE:** Use removed other than solar energy systems is clarified to only allow accessory roof-top systems (i.e. solar farms not permitted).

- b. Under C, industrial uses, iv., light industrial and manufacturing is not a use in the Land Development Code. This should be changed to light manufacturing.

**RESPONSE:** Revised.

- c. While warehouse and distribution is defined within the Land Development Code it is a broad definition. There is an opportunity within the PUD to redefine warehouse and distribution and add a definition for a fulfillment center and/or last mile distribution and prohibit that type of large distribution use.

**RESPONSE:** Additional clarification has been added to the definition to exclude certain types of warehouse/distribution facility.

9. Number 6, Development Standards:

- a. While it is understood that the sketch plan was approved with a maximum building height of 90 feet, there should be a consideration for the feasibility of 90 feet across the site. Staff recommends a height table that dictates maximum height per lot, with reduced height for industrial uses on Lot 7.

**RESPONSE:** Revisions have been made to the height allowances on a lot-by-lot basis.

- b. The ultimate alignment of Old Denver Road could impact these setbacks. Let's evaluate with the next review.
- c. **RESPONSE:** Setbacks have been revised to reflect proposed realignment of Old Denver Road.
- d. What is the lot coverage maximum for residential uses? Only nonresidential is specified at 40%.

**RESPONSE:** Revised.

10. Please revise number 7 to state Preliminary PUD Plan.

**RESPONSE:** Revised.

11. Please revise number 8 to state Town of Monument Roadway Design and Technical Criteria.

**RESPONSE:** Revised.

12. Please revise number 9 to state the Section of Code for Table 5.1.

**RESPONSE:** Revised.

13. Number 10, Architectural and Design:

- a. Revise to include language adhering to the outdoor lighting requirements from Section 18.05.330 – approved fixtures of the Town's Municipal Code.

**RESPONSE:** Revised.

- b. Add a standard for incorporating variable pitch parapet or other architectural controls that limit continuous flat roof for buildings. When practical, a pitched roof design should be implemented.

**RESPONSE:** Revised to require varied parapet height or design for flat roof buildings. It is not practical to require a pitch roof design for non-residential development.

14. Number 12, Definitions:

- a. Why does the plan need to redefine building height and building setback? Please use the Code definitions.

**RESPONSE:** Removed.

- b. Redefine warehouse and distribution and create a definition for last mile distribution or fulfillment centers.

**RESPONSE:** Additional clarification has been added to the definition to exclude certain types of warehouse/distribution facility.

15. Number 13, Industrial uses:

- a. Staff understands that the PUD is setting specific standards for industrial that vary from the Land Development Code. Below are items that are important to carry forward to the PUD plan:

- i. C, screening, has removed the 6-foot minimum as required by code. Please include that the 6-foot screening would be a fence, wall, hedge, landscaping, earth berm,

natural buffer area, or any combination thereof shall be provided to obscure an industrial use.

**RESPONSE: Added**

- ii. The preliminary PUD plan should at least reference 18.04.150 related to other External Effects not currently listed.

**RESPONSE: This is addressed in f.ii. – “The industrial use shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local regulations concerning the vibration, material handling and waste disposal, radioactive material, water pollution, air pollution, and other emissions.”**

- iii. ciii, d and e appear to be in conflict. If every industrial use should be enclosed in a building, why is there an allowance for outside storage? Recommend the elimination of outdoor storage as a principal use and limit to accessory use.

**RESPONSE: Outdoor storage has been limited to accessory use only.**

- iv. Other design standards for industrial to address as part of the resubmittal:
  - 1. Requirement for a maximum building square footage.

**RESPONSE: The PUD has reduced the maximum square footage for Industrial uses from 500,000 sq.ft. to 395,000 sq.ft., limited the maximum building size allowed to 175,000 sf as shown on the land use chart, and includes additional standards related to loading docks/berths to limit the type of industrial uses allowed.**

- 2. Any other design standards to add? Limit the amount of distribution space within the building OR stating that there needs to be an office component – avoiding the large distribution only concept.

**RESPONSE: The limit on the maximum building size and the clarification of the “warehousing and distribution” use definition addresses this.**

- b. Please revise planned development to planned unit development.

**RESPONSE: Revised.**

16. Development Landscape Standards:

- a. #3a landscape buffers, states a minimum 15-foot-wide landscape buffer. However, Section 18.04.150 – Industrial uses, states a minimum 50-foot-wide landscape buffer shall be provided along any property line where an industrial use is adjacent to a less intense use or zone district. A buffer is an important element to include between uses of different intensity. However, the buffer can be a combination of landscape setback and setback between buildings. Clarify how the buffer between the industrial and multi-family will be accomplished.

**RESPONSE: It is proposed to provide a 50-foot building setback minimum between adjacent industrial and residential uses within the PUD zone, which will incorporate a 15-foot minimum landscape buffer that will provide buffer planting as set out in the PUD landscape standards. The 15-foot landscape buffer and associated planting could be on either the industrial or residential lot or staggered between the two. This landscape standard has been amended accordingly.**

- b. The statement of one tree shall be planted for every 25 linear feet of the buffer length is correct. However, the statement of at least 50% shall be evergreen trees not currently in

Code. What is the reason for the changes? 50% evergreen seems inadequate within the buffer category.

**RESPONSE:** Revised to require all buffer trees to be evergreens.

*Preliminary PUD Plan:*

17. Please revise the roadway classification for Sante Fe Valley Trail to local type II (commercial).  
**RESPONSE:** Revised based on proposed change to Old Denver Road alignment.
18. Please revise the roadway classification for Conexus Way to minor collector (commercial).  
**RESPONSE:** Revised based on proposed change to Old Denver Road alignment.
19. Old Denver Road is classified as a major collector.  
**RESPONSE:** Revised
20. Please revise the roadway classification for Crossfield Drive to local type II (commercial).  
**RESPONSE:** Revised based on proposed change to Old Denver Road alignment.
21. Please show the 10-foot building setback off the internal spine road. If the internal spine road changes, setbacks should be updated.  
**RESPONSE:** Revised based on proposed change to Old Denver Road alignment.
22. Please show the 10-foot landscape setback off the internal spine road. If the road becomes a greater classification, a wider landscape setback should be provided.  
**RESPONSE:** Revised based on proposed change to Old Denver Road alignment.

*Misc:*

1. Please provide the “will serve” letter from TriView Metropolitan District.
2. **RESPONSE:** Included with resubmittal
3. Please include a trail crossing detail.
4. **RESPONSE:** Added.

Copies of revised plans and reports are attached. If you have any questions, please contact me at 719.471.0073 or abarlow@nescolorado.com.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andrea Barlow', written in a cursive style.

**Andrea Barlow, AICP**  
Principal, N.E.S. Inc.