

Date: December 6, 2022

Project: Vue De La Parc

Location: 0 S. 8th Street  
Colorado Springs, CO 80905

To: Pikes Peak Regional Building Department  
2880 International Circle  
Colorado Springs, CO 80910

## Public Comment Responses:

Michael & Annette Kohnert, Amy Roehl, Jan & Jennings Larson “In our initial contact via email on (06-19-21) it was stated that the pre-application poster was not per City Planning requirements. A photo of such was submitted, clearly showing the poster does not meet pre-application requirements, ‘All posters should be posted in a very visible location on the site, which can be viewed by passing motorist and/or pedestrians without trespassing.’ After review of the resubmittal data, we have the following comments, questions and or concerns that were not addressed in the resubmittal information nor by the Architect/ Developer’s response letter.

### Exception to the Pre-application Poster

1. As a friend and I walk past this site every day, the only way to read the poster was to trespass on the property as the poster was located near the center of the property not on 8th Street or near any walkways or bike paths in the area. It was also obscured by the ‘For Sale’ signage.
2. It is our understanding that ‘the applicant’ is required to submit an affidavit to show the reviewing planner confirmation that the proposed site was appropriately posted.’ If such an affidavit does exist, we are of the Opinion that it would not be valid.
3. Since we don’t feel that the pre-application poster allowed for proper responses by people in the vicinity, we feel the process should be started again to properly meet the Development process requirements and allow for public comments. We suggest that the posting should include a development picture of the proposed structure.

### Exception to the Traffic Study

1. The data was taken during covid (March 2020) and, in our opinion, does not accurately depict the actual conditions that we see, on a daily basis.
2. Also, all the site plans that the architect, civil and traffic engineers provided, in the resubmittal, do not show the additional driveways in proximity of this site. There are (4) additional driveways on the East Side of 8th Street between Olympic Village Drive and Motor City Drive. These would be the (2) driveways into the restaurant areas, (1) driveway to access Summer Games Drive (access to office buildings, storage, a car dealership, residences up on the hill on the opposite side of this plot of land) and Lake Side Auto.
3. The Traffic Study indicates that this is a (5) lane road, (2) each direction and a turning lane. Although this is accurate, the turning lane is quite frequently used as delivery lane for the car dealerships on the east side. This is because they cannot drive their trucks up on the steep driveways/roads without damage to both roads and trucks.
4. Added traffic count from new development does not seem realistic unless the development is intended for retirement community and/or low-income housing. Although Trip Generation (10th Edition) is probably used on most development projects around the city, this does not seem to have prevented the congestion problems we see throughout, where interchanges and other solutions could have been made with some foresight rather than the last-minute traffic light solution that we frequently see at each new intersection, which in itself causes traffic not to flow. We would like to point out that the “traffic light” solution in this area does not seem feasible as this is a very steep road with low visibilities in certain areas.

### Other concerns:

1. 8th Street’s underground springs were not reflected on the resubmittal plans. These caused years of agony for both building and business owners due to heavy build-up of ice at the bottom of their driveways. There were many close calls that could have had severe outcomes. Due to many years of persistence by the Building Owners and with the help of KRDO, we may finally have gotten the issue resolved last year. The city bored 8th Street at the corner of Olympic Village Drive and installed a 10” pipe to divert the water to the west side with the idea that there was more sunlight and no developed property and driveway that would be affected by the new drainage system. Note this drainage system terminates in proximity to the proposed development project property. This issue is not addressed in any of the development plans although this most certainly would have to be addressed so as not to create another hazard.
2. Our other concern is parking. Although the codes allow for the calculations done by the Architect, average ownership of cars in Colorado is (2) per family which does not include visitors. There is absolutely no overflow parking in close vicinity of this Project. This would appear to result in parking on the street. As this is currently not prohibited, this would definitely impact the flow of traffic and potentially create congestion. Also, there is a bicycle lane on the West Side of 8th Street. Cars parked on the street would cause bicyclists to have to merge into traffic.
3. The Architectural Plans indicate that the only Lighting on the Property would be low mounted full cut off bollards. We would assume that there are additional building mounted lights however not indicated. As this property backs up to Bear Creek Park and is located on the Hill, special care will need to be taken to specify low lumen full cut off Light fixtures that do not trespass beyond property line and disturb the Parks Wildlife. This should be addressed in the Development plan.
4. Finally, we do take objection to the administrative relief the Owner/Architect are asking for regarding the required set back and height as both those requirements should and could be met. We did not see any commentary regarding as to why they are asking for this ‘Relief’.

### In Conclusion

It is our opinion that the lack of a, properly installed, pre-application poster did not allow for proper responses by people in the vicinity and that the Traffic Study and Associate resubmittal plans do not clearly deal with the actual, every day, conditions that exist in proximity to this proposed development. We feel the process should be started again to properly meet the Development process requirements and allow for public comments. We suggest that the posting should include a development picture of the proposed structure.”

**Response:**

Poster:

1. The sign posting was deemed acceptable by the City. The affidavit was submitted and approved by the City. We will ensure any future postings are installed closer to the street to help visibility.

Traffic Study:

1. The Traffic Study was performed by a professional traffic engineer using standard practices. The City has found the Traffic Study acceptable.
2. The existing conditions (including driveways) along 8th Street were taken into account in the Traffic Study.
3. This development can not control how the turn lane is used on 8th Street and people parking illegally in the turn lane should not deter future development along 8th Street. I would recommend reporting this to the police.
4. Traffic counts and projections were made using standard practices.

Other Concerns

1. Part of the proposed development includes a large stormwater detention pond. This will be a net improvement for the areas stormwater management.
2. The parking proposed on-site exceed the amount required by the City. Any cars parking illegally off-site will be handled by the City Police. This development is close to public transit and trail systems and we anticipate that the parking provided on-site will be more than sufficient to meet the demands of the development.
3. Special care will be taken in the lighting. As you noted the parking lot lighting has been minimized, building lighting will be equally thoughtful.
4. The Administrative Relief criteria were submitted to the City in May of 2021. These have been attached to this response letter.

- Janet and Richard Murphy *"As a residential neighbor across the street from the proposed 4-story apartment development, we would ask that the present zoning (OC) remain. Our objections continue to be:*

1. *Height of the project*
2. *Increased traffic on 8th Street that doesn't manage number of vehicles at peak hours already. In case of a fire related emergency, it would be totally overwhelmed.*
3. *Increased noise"*

**Response:**

1. The height of the proposed project is within administrative compliance of what is allowed per the City of Colorado Springs Zoning Code.
2. The Traffic Study, Fire Department, and City Traffic Engineer all concur that 8th Street will not be overwhelmed by this project.
3. The project has no neighbors to the north or west, is located 170' away from the neighbor to the south, and over 200' from the closest neighbor to the east. This location makes it an ideal scenario for multi-family housing from a noise perspective.

- Janet and Richard Murphy *"I now see the letter attached from the architect and understand this project is allowable under the OC zoning. I am disappointed that this will be the view from our patio and deck for as long as we remain in this home. I am concerned the traffic study discounts my concerns about increased traffic on Eight Street. We take our life in our hands every time we pull out from the lower driveway onto Eighth Street. While I am relieved the proposed project is not 93 units, 53 is 53 more than I would hope for. I would have hoped for building more like the Red Cross building next door on this sight."*

**Response:**

1. We have made every effort to design a building that is aesthetically pleasing and code compliant. The Traffic Study, Fire Department, and City Traffic Engineer all concur that 8th Street will not be overwhelmed by this project.

Respectfully,  
Echo Architecture, LLC



Ryan Lloyd  
Architect  
ryan@echo-arch.com  
719.387.7836