

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 REQUEST AND DECISION FORM IN ASSOCIATION WITH A REQUEST FOR A PUD MODIFICATION FROM THE ECM

Updated: 6/26/2019

Pursuant to the <u>El Paso County Land Development Code</u>, the Board of County Commissioners may approve as part of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) approval a Modification to the <u>Engineering Criteria Manual</u> standards provided the Board can make the findings listed Section 4.2.6.F.2.h of the <u>Land Development Code</u>:

The proposal provides for the general health, safety, and welfare of the citizens and at least one of the following benefits:

- Preservation of natural features;
- Provision of a more livable environment, such as the installment of street furniture, decorative street lighting or decorative paving materials;
- · Provision of a more efficient pedestrian system;
- · Provision of additional open space;
- · Provision of other public amenities not otherwise required by the Code; or
- The proposed modification is granted in exchange for the open space and/or amenity designs provided in the PUD development plan and/or development guide.

The review and approval of this Deviation does not authorize construction of the requested improvements until and unless the Board of County Commissioners approves the Modifications in association with the Planned Unit Development request, the applicant has received approval of all associated engineering documents, the applicant has provided the necessary financial assurances, and a construction permit has been issued by the Planning and Community Development Department.

PROJECT INFORMATION Project Name: Urban Landing Preliminary Plan Schedule No.(s): 71360-01-045 Legal Description: See attached

APPLICANT INFORMATION

Company: Elite Properties of America, Inc.

Joe Loidolt Name:

Mailing Address: 2138 Flying Horse Club Dr.

Colorado Springs, CO 80921

Phone Number: 719-592-9333 FAX Number: 719-457-1442

Email Address : Joel@classichomes.com

ENGINEER INFORMATION

Company: Classic Consulting Engineers & Surveyors, LLC

Name: Marc A. Whorton, P.E.

Mailing Address: 619 N. Cascade Ave. Suite 200

Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Phone Number: 719-785-2802 FAX Number: 719-785-0799

Email Address: Mwhorton@classicconsulting.net

OWNER, APPLICANT, AND ENGINEER DECLARATION

To the best of my knowledge, the information on this application and all additional or supplemental documentation is true, factual 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 approval of this application is based on the representations made in the application and may be revoked on any breach of representation or condition(s) of approval.

O COLORED 37155 bwner for authorized representative Signature of

Colorado P.E. Number: 37155

Engineer's Seal, Signature And Date of Signature

9/4/2024

DEVIATION REQUEST (Attach diagrams, figures, and other documentation to clarify request)

A deviation from the standards of or in Section <u>LDC 8.4.4 (E) (2)</u> and <u>Section 2.2.4.B.7 Fig. 2-17, Table 2-7 and Section 2.3.8 of the Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM) is requested.</u>

| Identify the specific ECM standard which a deviation is requested: | include intersection spacing as part |
|---|--|
| Use of private roads is a deviation from the following: | of the deviation request as |
| Typical Roadway cross section for Urban Local Low-volume | trendsetter point does not meet |
| | ECM intersection spacing (150') |
| Use of private roads with no cul-de-sac is a deviation from the following: | |
| Roadway terminations require a cul-de-sac turn-around | from Spanish Bit Drive. |
| | |
| | Also attach exhibits of the proposed |
| | deviations as done in the previous |
| | submittal and add the endorsement |
| | |
| State the reason for the requested deviation: | from the fire district. |
| The unique small lot urban residential community being proposed will be rear load | |
| main community access is from a standard public local roadway (Spanish Bit Dr.) | , the use of the private roadways is limited to |
| closed looped areas that will be signed as being private. | |
| This type of "small lot" affordable development relies on high density site planning | a that will not support the typical public roadway |
| standards. (i.e. pavement width and cul-de-sac design) | g that will hot support the typical public loadway |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Evaluin the managed alternative and common to the ECM standards (Management) | |
| Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide as basis): | e applicable regional or national standards used |
| A standard county public local (low volume) roadway is contained within a 50' wid | le public right of way (with a 24' wide asphalt |
| mat) and requires cul-de-sac turn-arounds for any roadway termination. The prop | |
| 30' wide private tract (owned and maintained by the HOA) and includes a 22' wide | |
| end roads (Less than 200' as allowed by local Fire jurisdictions) with no cul-de-sa | |
| cul-de-sac turn-arounds are required. Options for these residential homes include | |
| parking or just two parking stalls with no garage. Parking along these private stre | ets will NOT be allowed. The lack of on street |
| parking is not a concern as there will be separate guest parking stalls provided. | |
| This site design is similar to the City of Colorado Springs "High density" developm | pont standards which allows for smaller private |
| roadway cross sections and short dead-end roads with no turn-around required as | |
| jurisdiction. We have met with Monument Fire District and have their support with | |
| ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| 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: |
| The unique community attributes include a high percentage of open space (30%+) that is the result of the private street use and rear garage access. The front doors of the applicable communities all face green belt open space corridors. The reduction in asphalt width has no impact on access or emergency vehicle maneuverability, as discussed with the Monument Fire District and provided fire truck access/turning movement exhibits. Reference attached endorsement e-mail from Monument Fire District. |
| |
| CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL |
| Per ECM section 5.8.7 the request for a deviation may be considered if the request is not based exclusively on financial considerations . The deviation must not be detrimental to public safety or surrounding property. The applicant must include supporting information demonstrating compliance with all of the following criteria : The deviation will achieve the intended result with a comparable or superior design and quality of improvement. |
| The proposed private streets provide individual lot access, including vehicular, pedestrian and ADA visit ability (where required). |
| The deviation will not adversely affect safety or operations. |
| No adverse safety or operations impacts are anticipated based on the following: |
| Private street section still allows for safe and adequate vehicular access to each individual lot Private street section still meets the intent of the County std. Urban Local Low-volume operations for this high density residential product type Private street section still provides safe and adequate access in and throughout the site for the local fire jurisdiction Private street section will be HOA maintained and will not have any adverse maintenance impact to El Paso County |
| |

| The deviation will not adversely affect maintenance and its | |
|---|--|
| As maintenance of the proposed private roads will be by the | ne HOA, no adverse maintenance or it's associated costs will be |
| realized. | |
| Tourizou. | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| The deviation will not advance by effect and the still and | |
| The deviation will not adversely affect aesthetic appearance | e. |
| The private roadway (accessing the garages) restricts in fr | ont facing homes along public streets and green belt corridors resulting |
| in a better, less garage face, aesthetic appearance. | 3 |
| in a better, less garage race, aestrictic appearance. | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| The deviation meets the design intent and purpose of the f | FCM standards |
| The deviation meets the design intent and purpose of the I | ECM standards. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| The deviation meets the design intent and purpose of the E Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. | ECM standards. Sposed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. Sposed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. Sposed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. Sposed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. Sposed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. possed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro | ECM standards. posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. | posed private streets while meeting the intent of the County Std. Urban |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |
| Providing individual lot access is still proposed with the pro- Local Low-volume roadway as indicated in the ECM. The deviation meets the control measure requirements of | Part I.E.3 and Part I.E.4 of the County's MS4 permit, as applicable. |

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION:

| Approved | by | the | ECM | Adm | inis | trat | or |
|-----------------|----|-----|------------|-----|------|------|----|
| | | | | | | | |

| This request has been determined to have met the criteria for approval. 2.2.4.B.7 Fig. 2-17, Table 2-7 and Section 2.3.8 of the ECM is hereby | |
|---|---|
| Г | ٦ |
| | |
| L | Т |
| Denied by the ECM Administrator This request has been determined not to have met criteria for approval. 2.2.4.B.7 Fig. 2-17, Table 2-7 and Section 2.3.8 of the ECM is hereby defined by the | |
| Г | ٦ |
| L | J |
| ECM ADMINISTRATOR COMMENTS/CONDITIONS: The Deviation is only valid until and unless the Board of County Comm | issioners approved the Dianned Unit Dovelopment |

| Modifications. |
|----------------|
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |
| |

1.1. 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.

1.2. 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.

1.3. 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.

1.4. 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.

1.5. TECHNICAL GUIDANCE

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

1.6. 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.

1.7. 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.