

September 24, 2018

Nina Ruiz,
Planner /Project Manager,
El Paso County Development Services Department,
2880 International Circle, Suite 110,
Colorado Springs,
CO 80910

Dear Ms. Ruiz:

RE: North Bay at Lake Woodmoor, PUD Development Plan (PUDSP-16-004) 2nd Review Response

This letter responds to your January 4, 2018 review letter relating to the above referenced project. Responses to review comments are shown in **RED** below.

EL PASO COUNTY PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Current Planning

Letter of Intent

1. Addressed.
2. Addressed.
3. Regarding Criteria No. 3, the site is not currently suitable for development due to floodplain, wetland, and shallow groundwater impacts. Revise the statement to identify these hazards and the proposed mitigation per the Entech report, specifically, CLOMR/LOMR finalization for floodplain, avoidance of wetland, and construction engineering and grading for the shallow groundwater. **Previously addressed but updated.**
4. Revise the response to Criteria No. 4 to include the approximate and/or average size of the natural buffer to the east and provide a statement regarding the additional landscaping provided with this plan. **Previously addressed.**
5. Revise response to Criteria No. 7 to include the amount/percentage of open space provided and to identify the trails as being intended for public use to access Lake Woodmoor. **Previously addressed.**
6. Include the discussion of the modification requests in the response to Criteria No. 1. Modifications are needed to authorize the use of private roads in the PUD, smaller road cross section for the private road (private roads are required to meet County standards which required 28' pavement width), and for the depiction of lots within the floodplain. **Addressed for private roads and cross-section. The lot lines and CLOMR have been amended so that there are no longer any lots within the proposed revised floodplain. A note has been added to the Plat**

that prevents the issue of Building Permits for those lots within the current floodplain until the FEMA map revision becomes effective.

7. Revise the preliminary plan Criteria No. 6 to include the discussion from comment no. 3 above, or refer to that discussion. **Previously addressed but updated.**
8. Revise response to preliminary plan Criteria No. 7 to include grading and erosion control plan, construction drawings for stormwater facilities. The reader may never see the drainage report. **Previously addressed.**
9. Revise response to Criteria No. 9.2 to state the plan was designed to minimize cost of transportation and utility infrastructure improvements. **Previously addressed.**

PUD Development Plan

1. Change all departmental references from “DSD/Development Services” to “Planning and Community Development Department”. **Addressed.**
2. Addressed.
3. Any accessory uses and/or special uses should be identified on the development plan, otherwise they will be prohibited by omission. If referencing the LDC, there are no sections only Chapters. **Previously addressed. Accessory uses are identified. No special uses proposed. Sections changed to Chapters.**
4. Addressed.
5. Addressed but the line types are difficult to read. Consider new line types to clearly define the existing and proposed floodplain. **Addressed.**
6. Addressed. Tract E and D do not have a separating lot line shown. **Addressed.**
7. Addressed.
8. Addressed. Please also remove existing trees/shrubs from the sign triangle. **Addressed.**
9. Include a parking table. **Addressed.**
10. Consider the adequacy of the proposed guest parking. Guest parking in townhome developments is absorbed quickly by guests and/or as tenants “third parking space”. **Previously addressed. There is sufficient parking to accommodate residents and guest parking. Each unit has a 2 car garage and the HOA covenants will require that these be kept available for parking. There are also 26 off-street parking bays and lots 15 and 16 have 2 car driveways, where only 10 guest parking spaces are required by Code.**

Engineering Division

PUD Development Plan

1. Resolved.
2. Add a note stating the proposed floodway is not applicable until the LOMR becomes effective. **Change the text from CLOMR to LOMR. Addressed**
3. Resolved.
4. Per ECM Table 2-5 the minimum intersection spacing is 330 ft. Adjust the layout to meet criteria or submit a deviation request. **Pending. Deviation request was not in the resubmittal. Deviation request was previously submitted and is submitted again.**
5. Resolved.
6. Resolved.
7. Resolved.

8. Resolved.
9. Resolved.
10. Resolved.

Traffic Impact Study

Resolved. **Noted.** Revised TIS uploaded with County file numbers added to cover.

Drainage Report

See engineering comments in the final plat application (PCD Project No. SF-16-021). **Addressed.**

Grading and Erosion Control Plan

See engineering comments in the final plat application (PCD Project No. SF-16-021). **Addressed.**

Attachment: Comment_PUDSP-16-004.docx

Redline comments on the following documents will be uploaded by the project manager. - PUD Development Plan - Traffic Study. **The above comments on the TIS indicate all issues resolved. No redlines on TIS were uploaded.**

EL PASO COUNTY COMMUNITY SERVICES - PARKS

These comments were endorsed by the Park Advisory Board on January 11th.

Recommend to the Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners that the approval of North Bay at Lake Woodmoor PUD Development Plan / Preliminary Plan include the following conditions: require fees in lieu of land dedication for regional park purposes in the amount of \$11,396 and urban park fees in the amount of \$7,196. **Noted.**

COLORADO DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES

It does not appear the estimated demand or proposed water supply for the development has changed since our last review; therefore, please refer to our letter dated December 28, 2016. **Noted. Dec 28, 2016 letter indicated that WWSD has sufficient water resources to serve the proposed development.**

NEPCO

1. The density of the proposed development provides a smooth transition between the neighbors to the east and to the west. **Noted.**
2. Shoreditch Heights and Redbridge Point roads are depicted as private roads on page 2. Because the future is difficult to predict, are they going to be constructed to El Paso County specifications if the residents (future Homeowners Association members) request the County assume responsibility for their maintenance? **The private streets are generally to be constructed to County standards, other than the specific modifications requested as part of the PUD Development/Preliminary Plan.**

The requested copies of all resubmittal documents have been uploaded to EDARP. If you have any questions please contact me at 719.471.0073 or abarlow@nescolorado.com.

Sincerely,



Andrea Barlow, AICP

Principal

N.E.S. Inc.