

Colorado Springs, CO

Planning and Development
30 S. Nevada Ave., Suite 701
Colorado Springs, CO 80903



Final Report - Corrections Required **Application No. DEPN-24-0160**

Report Date: 11/08/2024

Description : Multi-family development with 170 rental duplex units on one development lot. Also a request for alternate landscape compliance related to placement of streamside overly and property boundary buffer plantings, and to be allowed to provide 9.4% active open space where 10% is required.

Address : 2210 Old Ranch RD Colorado Springs CO 80920

Record Type : Development Plans

Document Filename : Cottages_At_Kettle_Creek_Project Statement_1st_Submittal.pdf

Comment Author Contact Information:

Reviewer Name	Reviewer Email	Reviewer Phone No.:
Amy Vanderbeek	amy@pprbd.org	-
Allison Stocker	Allison.Stocker@coloradosprings.gov	-
Austin Cooper	Austin.Cooper@coloradosprings.gov	-
Jonathan Scherer	Jonathan.Scherer@coloradosprings.gov	-

General Comments

Comment ID	Reviewer : Department	Review Comments
46	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	Info Only: Please contact the Lead Reviewer, Jonathan, with any questions. Please reference the Planning review number in all communications. jonathan.scherer@coloradosprings.gov
47	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	The drainage memo (STM-REV24-1079) was approved 9/26/24.
48	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	A PDR/FDR is required for this project. The PDR (STM-REV24-1247) has been reviewed. All major comments on the PDR must be resolved prior to approval of this DP.
49	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	Info Only: The Stormwater Enterprise (SWENT) has recently updated Criteria regarding required submittals. For all Development Plans (DPs) which previously required a Final Drainage Report (FDR) submittal (generally, all DPs with 1 acre or more of earth disturbance proposed), a Preliminary Drainage Report (PDR) submittal is now acceptable instead of an FDR submittal. This change in Criteria allows for such DPs to be approved without requiring detailed, final drainage design calculations at the planning stage of the project. For DPs with less than 1 acre of earth disturbance proposed, a Final Drainage Letter (FDL) submittal is required.

Comment ID	Reviewer : Department	Review Comments
		<p>A PDR submittal is now acceptable instead of an FDR submittal in support of a Final Plat (FP). The PDR must be approved before the FP can be recorded.</p> <p>An FDR may still be submitted in support of DP or FP approval if final design information is available at the time of the DP or FP submittal. FDR Addendums are no longer accepted. All required final calculations must be included in the FDR prior to FDR approval.</p> <p>FDR approval is still a prerequisite for Construction Drawing (CD) approval (e.g., GEC Plan, Drainage Plan/Profile, PCM Plan, etc.).</p> <p>Master Development Drainage Plans (MDDPs) are no longer required for DPs with 10 or more acres of earth disturbance proposed.</p> <p>Please see SWENT's website for updated checklists: https://coloradosprings.gov/stormwater-enterprise/page/stormwater-review</p>
50	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	It appears that a portion of the floodway is on the Site, revise floodplain statement too.
51	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	The Four Step Process and detention requirements must be met for this site, as disturbance is greater than 1 acre. Show provisions for WQ/Detention or provide a note on the cover sheet stating the name and location of the existing facility that provides water quality and detention for the site. The note must include the full FDR name that designed the PCM, who prepared that report, and the approval date of the report. If this Site is a redevelopment, detention may not be required if the downstream drainage system is shown to have capacity for the proposed developed flow.
52	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	This development is adjacent to Kettle Creek. Per the DPBS, stream improvements may be required. Please reach out to SWENT to determine if channel improvements are required.
53	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	A portion of the development appears to be within the 100-year floodplain. Please coordinate with the PPRBC floodplain administrator on any requirements needed for work within the floodplain. Please include all related correspondence and/or approval from floodplain administrator in the PDR/FDR for this site.
82	Austin Cooper : Planning	Please provide an Amendment History Table stating the City File #, Approval Date, and Purpose.
84	Austin Cooper : Planning	Upon resubmittal, please go to your Accela project page by looking up your application record number (ex. DEPN-24-0000 or SUBD-24-0000). Once there, select the button that says "Digital Projects". This will take you to a page where all open reviewer comments will be displayed and you will have the option to type in responses. You are required to respond to all open review comments before you can resubmit. After entering all responses, the website will prompt you to move forward and upload your revised documents. Please reach out to your Planner if you have any questions or issues with your resubmittal.
85	Austin Cooper : Planning	Please include your signed copy of the public notice affidavit with the resubmittal package. The project will not be approved until this document has been provided back to your Planner.
86	Austin Cooper : Planning	Staff reserves the right to provide additional comments with new or updated information provided in subsequent submittals.
87	Austin Cooper : Planning	Staff is still receiving comments from the neighborhood at the time the review letter is being sent. Staff will send a completed list of comments to the applicant that they will need to respond to in a comment response letter due at time of resubmittal.
21	Amy Vanderbeek : Regional Building-Enumerations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Note: There are only 2 of the standalone services to duplexes and house panel service meters. 2. The trash enclosure does not meet the requirement based on height to have an address assigned and separate permit issued. 3. Provide the location of the irrigation meter so that an address can be assigned.

Comment ID	Reviewer : Department	Review Comments
		<p>4. I am only seeing 6 garages not 7. Please label the 7th.</p> <p>5. Regarding the shaded seating area, how is it shaded? Gazebo, canopy?</p> <p>6. Each duplex structure will be assigned a single address with unit numbers 101 & 201. Contact me when you are ready to have the area addressed.</p> <p>Amy Vanderbeek Enumerations Plans Examiner Pikes Peak Regional Building Department O: 719-327-2930 E: Amy@pprbd.org</p>

Corrections in the following table need to be applied before a permit can be issued

Comment ID	Page Reference	Reviewer : Department	Review Comments
19	10	Allison Stocker : Planning	I thought that all SS-O plantings were to be within the residential development? Or are these intended to make up for any disturbance to the stream as a result of the added storm pipe?

- An eastbound left turn deceleration lane at Site Access along Old Ranch Road since the development's peak hour left turn ingress volumes exceed the City's threshold of 25 VPH.
- Old Ranch Road/Voyager Parkway westbound left and right should be increased and southbound left should be increased.
- Old Ranch Road/Otero Avenue/Site Access eastbound and westbound should be 155'.

CONFORMANCE WITH STREAMSIDE OVERLAY REVIEW CRITERIA (7.2.603 C.)

1. Has the natural landform been maintained within the overlay area and does grading conform to the specific grading limitations of this Section as well as all other City grading and filling regulations?

The development plan retains all of the streamside area's natural open space, except for grading related to a storm sewer outlet pipe from the new on-site detention pond to the creek. As such, the majority of the Streamside buffer areas will be left in a natural state, which protects the stream ecosystem. The site is designed to have minimum impact on the creek and adjacent Streamside buffers but will take advantage of the views of the natural area, which helps to include the stream in the development for patrons.

2. Does the development incorporate the stream ecosystem into the project design and complement the natural streamside setting? Has the project been designed to link and integrate adjacent properties with the stream corridor using accessways, creek front plazas, employee recreational areas or other site planning and landscaping techniques which include the stream corridor as an amenity?

The site is designed to have minimum impact on the creek and adjacent Streamside Buffers but will take advantage of the views of the natural area, which helps incorporate and bring attention to the stream. There is a vast natural open space through which the stream traverses, to the east of the subject property. While this land is privately owned, and will likely be developed at some point, the portion of that property is narrow and will likely be left in open space just as the area on the subject property will be. Because the area adjacent to the stream on the subject property is habitat for the Preble's meadow jumping mouse, a trail and other active open space amenities are proposed adjacent to, but outside of the habitat area.

3. Has the project been designed to minimize impact upon wildlife habitat and the riparian ecosystem which exists on or adjacent to the site? Does the project design protect established habitat or any known populations of any threatened or endangered species or species of special concern?

Both the inner and outer buffers are designated as critical habitat for the Preble's meadow jumping mouse, as is the area within 150' of the outer buffer. No grading or development, except for a drainage pipe outfall and planting of streamside buffer trees, is proposed within these areas. The US Department of Fish and Wildlife Services is reviewing a request for concurrence related to the Preble's meadow jumping mouse habitat on the property. Further, the required Streamside Overlay and south property line buffer plantings are being planted along the breeze trail between the homes and the Preble's meadow jumping mouse habitat instead of within the habitat areas.

I thought that all SS-O plantings were to be within the residential development? Or are these intended to make up for any disturbance to the stream as a result of the added