

**Planning and Community Development Department** 2880 International Circle Colorado Springs, Colorado 80910

Phone: 719.520.6300 Fax: 719.520.6695

Website www.elpasoco.com

# **DEVIATION REQUES1** AND DECISION FORM

Updated: 6/26

## PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name:

**Eldorado Springs Apartments** 

Schedule No.(s):

6433301049

Legal Description:

Lot 1 Independence Place at Cheyenne Mountain Filing No. 1

# APPLICANT INFORMATION

Company

ESH Development LLC

Name:

**Emery Chukly** 

Owner

Mailing Address:

5671 N. Oracle Road Suite 1102

Phone Number:

(520) 907 2807

FAX Number:

(520) 797 2648

Email Address:

echukly@gmail.com

# **ENGINEER INFORMATION**

Company: WestWorks Engineering

Name: Chad Kuzbek, PE

Mailing Address: 1023 W. Colorado Avenue Colorado Springs, CO 80904 Colorado P.E. Number: 35751

Phone Number: 719-685-1670 x20

FAX Number: N/A

Email Address: chad@westworksengineering.com

# OWNER, APPLICANT, AND ENGINEER DECLARATION

To the best of my knowledge, the information on this application and all additional or supplemental documentation is true, fact and complete. I am fully aware that any misrepresentation of any information on this application may be grounds for denial. I have familiarized myself with the rules, regulations and procedures with respect to preparing and filing this application. I also understand that an incorrect submittal will be cause to have the project removed from the agenda of the Planning Commission Board of County Commissioners and/or Board of Adjustment or delay review until corrections are made, and that any approva this application is based on the representations made in the application and may be revoked on any breach of representation condition(s) of approval.

Signature of owner (or authorized representative)

Engineer's Seal, Signature And Date of Signature

35751

4/9/21

Date

BOOK SIONAL ENOUGH

(ECM) is requested.

State the reason for the requested deviation:  1. The adjacent neighbor does not want it installed (Adam Jurado - City Public Works Inspector 719-424-8499.  2. The sidewalk does not it is to any other pedestrian access route leaving pedestrians stranded.  3. The grades along Westmark Avenue do not meet ADA standards for longitudinal grade - up to 11+%. The maximum longitudinal slope for an ADA accessible route is 5%. 11% creates a potential hazard for wheelchai colling backwards or tipping over. This is a potential liability issue for the County.  Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standars as basis):  Leave Westmark Avenue with no sidewalk as is the current condition.	Construction of a ci	CM standard which a deviation is requested: dewalk along Westmark Avenue.
1. The adjacent neighbor does not want it installed (Adam Jurado - City Public Works Inspector 719-424-8499 2. The sidewalk does not tie to any other pedestrian access route leaving pedestrians stranded.  3. The grades along Westmark Avenue do not meet ADA standards for longitudinal grade - up to 11+%. The maximum longitudinal slope for an ADA accessible route is 5%. 11% creates a potential hazard for wheelchair rolling backwards or tipping over. This is a potential liability issue for the County.  Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards basis):	Jonati delicit of a 3	dewalk along Westmank Avenue.
1. The adjacent neighbor does not want it installed (Adam Jurado - City Public Works Inspector 719-424-8499 2. The sidewalk does not tie to any other pedestrian access route leaving pedestrians stranded.  3. The grades along Westmark Avenue do not meet ADA standards for longitudinal grade - up to 11+%. The maximum longitudinal slope for an ADA accessible route is 5%. 11% creates a potential hazard for wheelchair rolling backwards or tipping over. This is a potential liability issue for the County.  Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards basis):		
1. The adjacent neighbor does not want it installed (Adam Jurado - City Public Works Inspector 719-424-8499 2. The sidewalk does not tie to any other pedestrian access route leaving pedestrians stranded.  3. The grades along Westmark Avenue do not meet ADA standards for longitudinal grade - up to 11+%. The maximum longitudinal slope for an ADA accessible route is 5%. 11% creates a potential hazard for wheelchair olling backwards or tipping over. This is a potential liability issue for the County.  Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards basis):		
1. The adjacent neighbor does not want it installed (Adam Jurado - City Public Works Inspector 719-424-8499 2. The sidewalk does not tie to any other pedestrian access route leaving pedestrians stranded.  3. The grades along Westmark Avenue do not meet ADA standards for longitudinal grade - up to 11+%. The maximum longitudinal slope for an ADA accessible route is 5%. 11% creates a potential hazard for wheelchair rolling backwards or tipping over. This is a potential liability issue for the County.  Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards basis):		
1. The adjacent neighbor does not want it installed (Adam Jurado - City Public Works Inspector 719-424-8499 2. The sidewalk does not tie to any other pedestrian access route leaving pedestrians stranded.  3. The grades along Westmark Avenue do not meet ADA standards for longitudinal grade - up to 11+%. The maximum longitudinal slope for an ADA accessible route is 5%. 11% creates a potential hazard for wheelchair rolling backwards or tipping over. This is a potential liability issue for the County.  Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards basis):		
1. The adjacent neighbor does not want it installed (Adam Jurado - City Public Works Inspector 719-424-8499 2. The sidewalk does not tie to any other pedestrian access route leaving pedestrians stranded.  3. The grades along Westmark Avenue do not meet ADA standards for longitudinal grade - up to 11+%. The maximum longitudinal slope for an ADA accessible route is 5%. 11% creates a potential hazard for wheelchair rolling backwards or tipping over. This is a potential liability issue for the County.  Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards basis):		
1. The adjacent neighbor does not want it installed (Adam Jurado - City Public Works Inspector 719-424-8499 2. The sidewalk does not tie to any other pedestrian access route leaving pedestrians stranded.  3. The grades along Westmark Avenue do not meet ADA standards for longitudinal grade - up to 11+%. The maximum longitudinal slope for an ADA accessible route is 5%. 11% creates a potential hazard for wheelchair rolling backwards or tipping over. This is a potential liability issue for the County.  Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards basis):		
2. The sidewalk does not tie to any other pedestrian access route leaving pedestrians stranded. 3. The grades along Westmark Avenue do not meet ADA standards for longitudinal grade - up to 11+%. The maximum longitudinal slope for an ADA accessible route is 5%. 11% creates a potential hazard for wheelchair colling backwards or tipping over. This is a potential liability issue for the County.  Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards basis):	State the reason for t	he requested deviation:
maximum longitudinal slope for an ADA accessible route is 5%. 11% creates a potential hazard for wheelchair colling backwards or tipping over. This is a potential liability issue for the County.  Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards basis):	2. The sidewalk doe	es not tie to any other pedestrian access route leaving pedestrians stranded.
Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards basis):		
Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards (standards):		
as basis):	oming backwards of	Tapping over the is a peternial habitity lesses for the searty.
as basis):		
	Explain the proposed as basis):	I alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional of national standards)
Ecave Westmank / Wende with the sidewalk as is the editent condition.		Avenue with no sidewalk as is the current condition
	Leave Westmark	Avenue with no sidewark as is the current condition.

### LIMITS OF CONSIDERATION

(At least one of the conditions listed below must be met for this deviation request to be considered.)

The ECM standard is inapplicable to the particular situation.

Topography, right-of-way, or other geographical conditions or impediments impose an undue hardship and an equivalent alternative that can accomplish the same design objective is available and does not compromise public safety or accessibility. A change to a standard is required to address a specific design or construction problem, and if not modified, the standard will impose an undue hardship on the applicant with little or no material benefit to the public.

### Provide justification:

- 1. The adjacent neighbor does not want it installed (Adam Jurado City Public Works Inspector 719-424-8499).
- 2. The sidewalk does not tie to any other pedestrian access route leaving pedestrians stranded.
- 3. The grades along Westmark Avenue do not meet ADA standards for longitudinal grade up to 11+%. The maximum longitudinal slope for an ADA accessible route is 5%. 11% creates a potential hazard for wheelchairs rolling backwards or tipping over. This is a potential liability issue for the County.

#### **CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL**

Per ECM section 5.8.7 the request for a deviation may be considered if the request is <u>not based</u> <u>exclusively on financial considerations</u>. The deviation must not be detrimental to public safety or surrounding property. The applicant must include supporting information demonstrating compliance with <u>all</u> <u>of the following criteria</u>:

The deviation will achieve the intended result with a comparable or superior design and quality of improvement.

Westmark Avenue currently exists with no sidewalk. We request this condition remain unchanged.

The deviation will not adversely affect safety or operations.

Safety and liability concerns regarding pedestrian ADA accessibility and steep grades will be mitigated as this roadway cannot not have an ADA accessible pedestrian route.

г	1
L	J
Denied by the ECM Administrator	
This request has been determined not to have met criteria for approval.  of the ECM is hereby denied.	. A deviation from Section
Γ	1
L	J
ECM ADMINISTRATOR COMMENTS/CONDITIONS:	

#### PURPOSE

The purpose of this resource is to provide a form for documenting the findings and decision by the ECM Administrator concerning a deviation request. The form is used to document the review and decision concerning a requested deviation. The request and decision concerning each deviation from a specific section of the ECM shall be recorded on a separate form.

#### BACKGROUND

A deviation is a critical aspect of the review process and needs to be documented to ensure that the deviations granted are applied to a specific development application in conformance with the criteria for approval and that the action is documented as such requests can point to potential needed revisions to the ECM.

### APPLICABLE STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

Section 5.8 of the ECM establishes a mechanism whereby an engineering design standard can be modified when if strictly adhered to, would cause unnecessary hardship or unsafe design because of topographical or other conditions particular to the site, and that a departure may be made without destroying the intent of such provision.

#### APPLICABILITY

All provisions of the ECM are subject to deviation by the ECM Administrator provided that one of the following conditions is met:

- The ECM standard is inapplicable to a particular situation.
- Topography, right-of-way, or other geographical conditions or impediments impose an undue hardship on the applicant, and an equivalent alternative that can accomplish the same design objective is available and does not compromise public safety or accessibility.
- A change to a standard is required to address a specific design or construction problem, and if not modified, the standard will impose an undue hardship on the applicant with little or no material benefit to the public.

### TECHNICAL GUIDANCE

The review shall ensure all criteria for approval are adequately considered and that justification for the deviation is properly documented.

#### LIMITS OF APPROVAL

Whether a request for deviation is approved as proposed or with conditions, the approval is for project-specific use and shall not constitute a precedent or general deviation from these Standards.

#### REVIEW FEES

A Deviation Review Fee shall be paid in full at the time of submission of a request for deviation. The fee for Deviation Review shall be as determined by resolution of the BoCC.