

Planning and Community
DEVIATION REQUEST Development Department 2880 International Circle Colorado Springs, Colorado 80910
Phone: 719.520 .6300
Fax: 719.520.6695
Website www.elpasoco.com

## PROJECT INFORMATION

| Project Name: | Trails at Aspen Ridge Filing No. 2 |
| ---: | :--- |
| Schedule No.(s): | 5500000412 |
| Legal Description: | Unplatted Land |

## APPLICANT INFORMATION

Company: COLA, LLC
Name: Tim Buschar
® Owner $\square$ ConsultantContractor
Mailing Address : 555 Middle Creek Pkwy, Suite 380
Colorado Springs, CO 80921

Phone Number: (719) 382-9433
FAX Number :
Email Address :

## ENGINEER INFORMATION

| Company: | Matrix Design Group | Colorado P.E. Number: 52434 |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Name: | Nicole Schanel |  |  |
| Mailing Address: | 2435 Research Parkway, Suite 300 |  |  |
|  | Colorado Springs, CO 80920 |  |  |
| Phone Number: | $719-575-0100$ |  |  |
| FAX Number: |  |  |  |
| Email Address: | Nicole_schanel@matrixdesigngroup.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, 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


Signature of owner (or authorized representative)

Engineer's Seal, Signature And Date of Signature
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DEVIATION REQUEST (Attach diagrams, figures, and other documentation to clarify request)
A deviation from the standards of or in Section 2.3.4 of the Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM) is requested.
Identify the specific ECM standard which a deviation is requested:
Per Section 2.3.3.D. 2 "Superelevation is not permitted on roadways with design speeds of less than 50 mph "

State the reason for the requested deviation:
Transitioning from warped intersections on the west and east ends to a typical, crowned section on Nutterbutter Point and Turtle Lake Way is impractical due to the short lengths of these roads.

Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards used as basis):
In order to return to a crowned intersection and not superelevate the roadways of Turtle Lake Way and Nutterbutter Point, the rate of transition of grade would exceed comfortable and safe driving conditions. To mitigate this problem, the roads previously listed have maintained a superelevated cross section ranging from $2 \%$ to $5 \%$.
$\qquad$

## 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.
$\boxtimes$ 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. $\boxtimes$ 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:
In order to meet the intersecting roads of Big Johnson and Bird Ridge (4\%-5\%), the east and west ends of Turtle Lake Way and Nutterbutter Point have been warped. Using a transition of $1 \%$ in $25^{\prime}$, it is impossible to get back to a typical crowned section for either road due to the shortness of length. Maintaining a superelevated section allows for comfortable and safe driving conditions.

## 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.
Per Section 5.8 of the ECM, "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"

The design revision provides a superior design to the alternative and enables the intersections to meet EPC criteria.

The deviation will not adversely affect safety or operations.
The proposed deviation will not adversely impact the safety or operations of the proposed roadways.
$\qquad$

The deviation will not adversely affect maintenance and its associated cost.
The roadways with the requested deviations will be built in conformance with all other roadway design criteria and will not affect maintenance nor costs.

The deviation will not adversely affect aesthetic appearance.
The superelevation of the roadways will not have an affect on aesthetic appearance of the roadways.

The deviation meets the design intent and purpose of the ECM standards.
The intent and purpose of the ECM standard is to provide a logical relationship to the side friction factor. This has been applied to the proposed deviation design and allows for the deviation to meet the ECM design intent.

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. The proposed deviation is in conformance with Part I.E. 3 and Part I.E. 4 of the County's MS4 permit.
$\qquad$

## REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION：

Approved by the ECM Administrator
This request has been determined to have met the criteria for approval．A deviation from Section $\qquad$ of the ECM is hereby granted based on the justification provided．

「
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」

Denied by the ECM Administrator
This request has been determined not to have met criteria for approval．A deviation from Section $\qquad$ of the ECM is hereby denied．
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」

## ECM ADMINISTRATOR COMMENTS／CONDITIONS：

Approval of this deviation does not constitute approval of the configuration of the pedestrian ramps as shown on the exhibit．
$\qquad$

### 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.
$\qquad$
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