

Commissioners:

Sallie Clark (Chair)

Darryl Glenn (Vice-Chair)

Peggy Littleton

Dennis Hisey

Mark Waller

Planning and Community Development

Craig Dossey, executive Director

11/30/16

Thomas and Thomas

Jason Alwine

702 N. Tejon Street

Colorado Springs, CO. 80903

Dear Applicant and/or Consultant:

Subject: Lorson Ranch East PUD/Preliminary Plan (PUDSP-16-003) Review 1

**The purpose of this letter is to provide you with the review agency responses to the above named development application that have been received to-date by Planning and Community Development.**

**You are encouraged to directly contact those agencies that did provide review comments if the comments require additional action by the applicant/applicant’s representative. You are also encouraged to directly contact those agencies that did not provide review comments if such response is required by state statutes and the El Paso County Land Development Code.**

**EL PASO COUNTY PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**Planning**

This PUDSP (Planned Unit Development Plan Preliminary Plan) is being reviewed in accordance with the adopted El Paso County Land Development Code (2016), the El Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual (2015), and the El Paso County Drainage Manual (2016). Additionally, it is being reviewed under the procedures within the County’s Procedures Manual.

Letter of Intent

1. Please update the request to include both wet utilities and pre-development grading.
2. Please update the PUD modifications and provide justification (size of the development is not a reasonable justification).
3. The PUD is site specific establishing land uses, density, and development standards, It is not conceptual.
4. Add the 25 acre school site to the appropriate sections of the LOI.
5. Modify the statement regarding the dedication of the school site to read will be dedicated with Pioneer Landing 2, or the accompanying plat to this PUD/preliminary plan. The site will be zoned PUD school site with this application. [The PUD and Preliminary plan define the location of the school site, the Pioneer landing 2 plat was a placeholder, at that time the design of the Lorson East was underway.]
6. Add the statement that the School District is responsible to submit a site development plan for approval to El Paso County Planning and Community Development. Additionally, the School District shall address the traffic impact fees at the time of driveway permit.
7. Add the timing of Lorson Boulevard to the first phase of development per the 6th development agreement which requires a second access when development is planned east of the East Tributatry.
8. Clarify the proposed downgrading of Fontaine from 130’ to 100’ as shown on the PUDSP.
9. Fire protection report is a separate document, please make it so. Also, address the PUD modification for a private road that does not meet County Standards and the support of the Fire District.
10. Modify the discussion on density, as the approved sketch plan has varying densities and uses within the area.
11. The floodplain is a hazard. Lots are proposed in the floodplain; however, the applicant is mitigating the floodplain by requesting FEMA for a LOMR which will remove the floodplain hazard from the lots. The lots will be platted after the LOMR has been completed.

General

1. Provide a copy of the agreement (easement) between CSU-SDS and Lorson. The County Attorney’s Office will review to verify that no limitation(s) regarding development of public-rights-of way and associated easements exist.
2. The 6th development agreement requires the construction of a second access, Lorson Boulevard, with the development east of the East Tributary of Jimmy Camp Creek. Add a note to the PUDSP that this will be completed with Phase 1 of the development.
3. The development guidelines are missing all the relative land use standards and guidelines (see Master Plan comments below). Staff will not defer to the sketch plan at the residential site plan stage; provide specific standards for each area or lots.
4. Staff will not defer to the CCR’s for additional land uses. CCR’s are a civil matter not a zoning component. Please identify the allowed land uses, accessory uses, and temporary uses on the PUD plan. [day care, chickens, no roosters, adult care, garage sales, x-mas tree sales, schools, mother-in-law suites, second kitchens, churches, pre-schools, etc…]
5. Please define what the corner setback is. As it is written both frontages have a 10’ setback. Is there a front yard and a corner front yard where access is NOT taken? What is the accessory use setback for corner lots?
6. Staff does not support the PUD modification to eliminate landscape requirements from all collectors and minor-major arterials. At a minimum the landscape along Fontaine should be carried forth. Landscape along Lorson Boulevard and Lamprey Drive should also occur in a similar fashion. Staff notes landscape is not to be provided along the local roadways.
7. The typical 130’ cross section for Fontaine Blvd. detail does not match the labeling throughout the plan set.
8. Additionally, staff does not support deferring landscape (and the identification of landscape or buffer tracts) to a final plat stage. The landscape should be addressed at the PUD per the LDC. Provide a typical landscape (including fencing & trails) plan for the open space tracts, and collector and arterial roadways.
9. Provide the fencing details for the collectors or arterials at a minimum.
10. Identify the trails width and surface throughout the plan set. A detail should be provided in the landscape sheet.
11. There are tracts identified as 20 feet driveways shown that do not meet County standards. A driveway may only serve 3 lots. If more than 3 lots are to be served, than the roadway (driveway) should be a cul-de-sac road way. Additionally, all lots must be have a minimum of 30’ of public right-of-way frontage. Also, please address the double frontage lot requirements. (LDC-Chapter 8.4.3.C).
12. If you are requesting a private roadway include an additional PUD modification for private roadways (LDC-Chapter 8.4.4.E). Please add a note that private roadways are to be owned and maintained by XXX. The County will not maintain the private roadway. Is parking allowed on these roadways? Is 20 feet wide enough to adequately park a large vehicle (personal truck) and a passing emergency vehicle? The minimum standard for 90 degree two way drive isle is 24 feet. Verify the fire department will be able to serve the specific lots with a 20’ private roadway. What is the surface of this private roadway. A detail is necessary. A letter from the fire department is necessary to support the PUD modification.
13. Identify what the architectural control committee (ACC) is to review and at what stage under the ACC heading. Planning staff will not efficiently be able to hold, approve, or deny residential site plan applications waiting approval from the ACC is required for every home. Is that the developer’s intent?
14. A 2016 school land agreement is in effect. Please include the school tract with the PUD / preliminary plan, phase 1. Various documents throughtout the submittal should be updated including the legal. Fontaine Boulevard should not be included in the 25 acre school tract. A note should be placed on the PUD that the School District is responsible to submit a site development plan for approval to El Paso County Planning and Community Development. Additionally, the School District shall address the traffic impact fees at the time of driveway permit.
15. Excerpts from the recorded BoCC resolution below:

Master Plan

1. The Lorson Ranch Sketch Plan Amendment (SKP-16-001) identifies this area as RLM (4-6 units per acre), RM (7-10 units per acre), and RMH (10-13 units per acre). Verify that the PUDSP Lorson Ranch east is within the areas of density and land use designation. The open space finger on the 2015 sketch plan extends to the school site which is NOT consistent with the submitted PUDSP Lorson Ranch East. Justify the density exchange and elimination of open space in the LOI.





1. A finding of Master Plan Consistency was made at the previous Lorson Ranch Overall Development Plan and the 2015 Sketch Plan Amendment. A portion of the PUDSP for Lorson East, north of Fontaine Boulevard, is within the Highway 94 Small Area Plan (2003). The portion, south of Fontaine Boulevard, is not within a small area plan. Discussion should include how this is consistent with the sketch plan as amended in 2015 and the small area plan.

PUD/Preliminary Plan Map

1. Identify the match lines and provide an inset key.
2. The title block should be on all sheets.
3. Please separate the early grading from the PUD/Preliminary plan (leave the landscape plan set in the PUD). The early grading plan set is not recorded with the PUD.
4. The department is now Planning and Community Development Department (PCD), not DSD.
5. Add a note stating these sidewalks will be 5” and subject to the developer collateralizing and installing them. The future lot owner or builder is responsible to repair any damages.

Reports

1. Geology and Soils Report- The Land Development Code (2016) specifically states, in addition to these requirements [Code] the ECM requires soils investigation reports and mitigation… (page 8-58 Section 8.4.9.D).Please note, the Code does not define constraints; however staff has previously agreed to identify potential geologic hazards as constraints, as they can be mitigated for. The Geology report should identify the lot specific hazards (constraints) so that future lot owners are aware of the constraints and the necessary mitigation required to develop. The report does identify the existing floodplain hazard within a figure (map). The notes on the preliminary plan should reflect the hazard and corresponding lot numbers. The Geologic hazard note as written on the preliminary plan is not complete. For example, floodplain is a hazard which the applicant intends to mitigate by LOMR. Utilize the standard note format below:

The following lots have been found to be impacted by geologic hazards. Mitigation measures and a map of the hazard area can be found in the report *(Title of Report, generally from the Preliminary Plan file)* by *(author of the report) (date of report)* in file *(name of file and file number)* available at the El Paso County Development Services Department:

Unstable / potentially slopes: (*name lots or location of area*)

Floodplain: (*name lots or location of area*)

Hydrocompactive / expansive soil: (*name lots or location of area*)

Potentially Seasonally High Groundwater:*(name lots or location of area)*

**In Areas of High Groundwater:**

Due to high groundwater in the area, all foundations shall incorporate an underground drainage system.

1. The site is 225.76 acres not including the 25 acre school site that should be added to this preliminary plan, phase 1. Please add the number of required test borings accordingly (18 were included). Please include borings in the lotted area to be mitigated for floodplain hazards. The ECM requires 1 boring per 10 acres, and the LDC requires a boring per soil type.
2. You are encouraged to contact the CGS to resolve comments. Please see CGS comments for additional detailed comments. Please address the CGS comments within the response letter. (CGS coments not received as of 11/29/16).
3. Title Commitment Report- Please provide, via email, the electronic version with the live links so that the exceptions can be reviewed accordingly.
4. Water and Wastewater Reports- A 1041 may be required for the 24” water & wastewater lines that cross this preliminary plan area. A 16” sanitary line is identified as to be needed serve this development in the report within future Lorson Boulevard. Lorson Blvd. is not included within this preliminary plan. Future booster stations and holding tanks east of the transmission may also require a 1041. The commitment is specific to the 838 single-family lots for the preliminary plan. The water and wastewater commitment did not include a letter regarding the school tract which should be included.
5. The Natural Features report does not identify any limitations that would preclude development with exception to the East Jimmy Camp CreekTributary Channel which will be platted as a tract. However, the report indicated the study was limited to an area (page 4) north of Fontaine. The preliminary plan includes land south of Fontaine and should be revised accordingly. Note, non-jurisdictional wetlands (natural features) should be preserved in tracts and identified in the report.
6. The area is known for wildlife habitat. The document provided from the USFW, dated July 14, 2016 noted 11 known species on the wildlife list, none critical in the area proposed to be developed. It did note 22 migratory birds in the area and recommended further study to prevent loss of habitat.
7. The report did not include the school site.
8. Traffic Report-Update the traffic study to include the school site.
9. Please add the timing of the construction of Lorson and Fontaine boulevards to include the crossings.

**Engineering Division**

Planning and Community Development (PCD) Engineering reviews plans and reports to ensure general conformance with El Paso County standards and criteria. The project engineer is responsible for compliance with all applicable criteria, including other governmental regulations. Notwithstanding anything depicted in the plan in words or graphic representation, all design and construction related to roads, storm drainage, and erosion control shall conform to the standards and requirements of the most recent version of the relevant adopted El Paso County standards, including the Land Development Code (LDC), the Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM), the Drainage Criteria Manual (DCM), and the Drainage Criteria Manual Volume 2. Any deviations from regulations and standards must be requested in writing and approved by the ECM Administrator. Any modifications necessary to meet overlooked criteria after-the-fact will be the developer’s responsibility to rectify.

The following are Engineering Division comments regarding the submitted documents for the subject application. A written response to all comments is required for review of the re-submittal. Additional comments may be generated on items added or altered after the original comments.

**Due to the lack of complete information (submittal requirements), number of deviations and design issues as proposed, these comments are cursory in nature. Detailed comments will be provided upon receipt of complete information/plans, approved deviations, and resolution of the major planning and engineering issues. Emphasis is placed on obtaining approvals for any proposed deviations, which could require plan revisions delaying the review and approval process.**

Preliminary Plan/PUD DP

1. Confirm in the Phasing plan that the Lorson Boulevard connection will be made prior to reaching the cap of 1,750 dwelling units using Fontaine Boulevard. (A condition of approval regarding the required second point of access will be recommended for this development.)
2. Numerous deviations appear to be proposed including the following:
	1. At least 17 intersection spacings are less than criteria;
	2. Centerline curve radii (not verified – provide radius labels for all);
	3. Per ECM Table 2-7 and B.3.1.C, the design ADT of a Residential Collector is 10,000, which is exceeded by Lorson Boulevard. In a previous deviation approval (DEV-16-027) for the western portion of this road, the County Engineer specifically noted that the classification is a Non-Residential Collector.

Revise the Preliminary Plan design or provide deviation requests as appropriate.

1. Regarding the East Tributary Jimmy Camp Creek channel, if the channel will be dedicated to El Paso County for maintenance, “EPC” should be added to the maintenance table for those tracts on sheet P2. Add a note in the Floodplain Notes stating the maintenance entities of the floodplain tracts.
2. Provide a note regarding required noise study – reference ECM 2.5.3. Address where noise walls or other form of mitigation would be placed if required (tracts, etc.).
3. Provide and revise notes as applicable regarding the private road serving 7 lots and private driveway serving 3 lots. Provide standard cross-sections, including drainage facilities (swale or curb and gutter, etc.). See related Planning comments.
4. Provide a separate cross-section for Lorson Blvd. (see comment 2.c.)
5. Show conceptual tree location (ranges) on the typical section for Fontaine Blvd. and any other cross-sections where required.
6. Provide or reference a standard knuckle detail.
7. Consider extending the soft-surface trail parallel to Fontaine Blvd. and Lorson Blvd. to appropriate crossing locations.
8. Adjust the leaders for Tracts C, P and Q to be solid lines.
9. Sheets P3-P6:
	1. Show existing contours over the site and extending 100 feet from the Preliminary Plan boundary.
	2. Add labels or adjust linetypes for all features per the redlines.
	3. Include both FEMA floodplain and future developed floodplain boundaries. (See MDDP and Preliminary Drainage Report comments.)
	4. Label the proposed bridges over East Tributary Jimmy Camp Creek.
	5. Revise the sidewalks along Fontaine Blvd. (and possibly Lorson Blvd.) to be 6 feet wide.
	6. Label the proposed grade of Tiffin Drive.
	7. Label all centerline radii.
	8. Provide bearing and distance information on all centerlines.
10. Preliminary Landscape Plan (sheet L1):
	1. The proposed trees/plantings in proposed county rights-of-way will require written approval from the ECM Administrator, through a license/maintenance agreement. Issues such as mature tree size and height, high maintenance requirements, destructive root systems and potential leaf litter will need to be addressed. The landscaping shall be appropriate for the conditions and easily maintained.
	2. Verify that proposed trees will meet clear zone requirements from the sidewalk and the street and will not infringe on sight distance triangles. The street classification in the streetscapes table should be “4-Lane Principal Arterial”. Add a note that no landscaping shall obstruct sight distance triangles (reference ECM 2.3.6.G.). Per ECM sections 2.5.2.B.8 and 2.5.2.H (Figure 2-35), the minimum horizontal clearance (for sidewalks) around utility structures, furniture, and other encroachments shall be 4 feet or greater.to provide safe conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Transportation / Traffic Impact Study

1. Address the requirement in the Sixth Amended Development Agreement (2015) requiring construction of a second point of access to Lorson Ranch prior to development of more than 1,750 dwelling units east of the Jimmy Camp Creek main channel.
2. Address Preliminary Plan comment #2 (justification for deviations), specifically #2.c, in the TIS.
3. Address the timing and method of “fair share”/proportionate offsite improvement contributions including the Lorson Blvd./Marksheffel and Fontaine/Lamprey traffic signals/intersections.
4. Label Lorson Blvd. on the applicable figures.
5. On Figure 2, there appear to be some old road alignments overlapping the Preliminary Plan area; delete or label these alignments as appropriate.
6. Regarding the school site, include general traffic generation analysis and address the last requirement of ECM Section B.2.3.B regarding pedestrian facilities in the project vicinity. Address the pertinent pedestrian and bicycle analyses required by ECM Sections B.2.4.B, B.4.1.C and D.
7. Provide a summary table of recommended improvements and responsibilities.

Master Development Drainage Plan

1. Place the file number PUDSP-16-003 on the cover sheet.
2. Provide all required checklist items (attached). The East Tributary flows (existing and future; reference new DBPS) and channel improvements need to be addressed. No channel design calculations or referenced flowrates for the East Tributary were received with the submittal. Provide complete preliminary design information, calculations and modeling for the improved condition. Note: the analysis and design of stormwater facilities must be on future development flow rates; therefore, FEMA flow rates shall not be used without written approval. Further comments will be provided when the information is provided with the next submittal.
3. The East Tributary channel alignment and bank protection need to be specifically addressed, especially the substantial channel bends at the northwest corner of the project. With developed flow values and accounting for required superelevation freeboard, that portion of the site (sub-basin EX-C9) appears likely to need to be elevated and protected if developed. Address the required criteria, including minimum channel radius.
4. Show and label the site boundary on the soils map. The outline shown on the soils map does not coincide with the site boundary.
5. Clearly show and label the site boundary on the FIRM panels.
6. Include all of the soil types shown within the site boundary in Table 3:1.
7. Remove the hydrologic soil group from the Existing Conditions map or use a different hatch and show all applicable soil groups.
8. Use a darker linetype and include the 100 year floodplain in the legend on the Existing Conditions map.
9. Page 5 first sentence – Is the MDDP referencing a different MDDP?
10. Page 19 – Add a reference for BoCC Resolution No. 15-042 – El Paso County adoption of Chapter 6 and Section 3.2.1 Chapter 13 of the City of Colorado Springs Drainage Criteria Manual dated May 2014.
11. Include design point 7c in the Design Point Summary Table on the Overall Developed Conditions map.
12. Is design point 26 really design point 20 (Overall Developed Conditions map)?
13. Verify the flow out of POND D2; 2 cfs in the 100-year seems low (DP 10b as shown on the Overall Developed Conditions map).
14. The pond discharges from DP 19 and 20 appear to be higher than 90% of those shown on the Existing Conditions map, please confirm the release amounts for these two locations.
15. See redlined report and plans for clarification of these comments and further minor comments.

Preliminary Drainage Report

1. Place the file number, PUDSP-16-003, on the cover sheet.
2. Provide all required checklist items (attached). The East Tributary flows (existing and future; reference new DBPS) and channel improvements and bridges need to be addressed. Further comments will be provided when the information is provided with the next submittal.
3. Address MDDP comments (above) accordingly in this report.
4. The Drainage Criteria to be referenced throughout the report is the older version of the City of Colorado Springs/El Paso County Drainage Criteria Manual. El Paso County only adopted Chapter 6 and Section 3.2.1 Chapter 13 of the City of Colorado Springs Drainage Criteria Manual dated May 2014 (BoCC Resolution No. 15-042).
5. On page 3, revise the reference to this report as an MDDP to Preliminary Drainage Report.
6. Address the method of funding and construction timing for the required East Tributary Jimmy Camp Creek channel and bridge improvements. Any necessary stabilization improvements adjacent to proposed subdivision lots need to be constructed prior to filing the plat(s) of the respective subdivision(s). If these improvements are to be deferred, limitations on which tracts may be developed prior to the channel improvements, responsibility for design and construction, and timing needs to be documented in the a development agreement or SIA at time of platting.
7. Show and label the site boundary on the soils map. The outline shown on the soils map does not coincide with the site boundary.
8. Clearly show and label the site boundary on the FIRM panels.
9. Include all of the soil types shown within the site boundary in Table 3:1.
10. Provide existing condition calculations.
11. The proposed interim ponds release rates and outfall structures need to account for and allow the release of historic flows and the downstream development needs to accommodate and be designed for these flows. Provide a comparison table at all historic/existing design points. If flows are over-detained, the water rights necessary to hold these volumes need to be addressed and overflow spillways and conveyances need to be designed. An overall hydrologic model (HEC-HMS and/or excerpts from the recent DBPS) is required to address this issue and the overall pre- and post-development channel flows.
12. As the release rate for POND D2 appears to be incorrect in the MDDP, the confirmation that the release rate from POND D2 matches the release rate from the MDDP will need to be provided with the next submittal.
13. Revise the reference to Carriage Meadows South on page 44.
14. Address WQCV for sub-basin C16.37. Provide a statement in Section 6.0 of the report that WQCV is provided for the entire development (in accordance with ECM I.7.1.B) or reference an approved deviation for areas proposed not to be treated.
15. Note: Pipe and inlet sizes were not reviewed in detail, pending any changes resulting from overall site revisions (if deviations are not approved).
16. Provide riprap sizing calculations.
17. Address the necessary subsurface geotechnical investigations that will be provided with the pond designs, including analyses for outfall design, key-in, slope and embankment compaction requirements.
18. Include a cost estimate for the proposed drainage improvements necessary with the overlot grading.
19. Existing Drainage Plan:
	1. See redlines.
20. Proposed Drainage Plan:
	1. Provide a general location/vicinity and key map on each drainage plan.
	2. Label the site boundary and include in the legend on Sheets 2-5.
	3. Show and label the FEMA and future developed floodplains.
	4. Provide cross sections for all swales and channels, showing flow details, channel lining materials and easements.
	5. Identify maintenance access road locations and provide cross-sections.
	6. Identify spillway, rundown, and access locations and provide design details for all of the ponds.
	7. Confirm that the Interim Pond designs match with the pre-development site grading plan.
	8. Include the existing utility easement boundary in the legend and label the width of the utility easements and SDS easement.
21. Revise the conclusion to reflect the current status and remaining improvements for the East Tributary and detention and water quality facilities.
22. Note: Permission will be required from MVEA and other utility easement grantee(s) where applicable prior to approval of the grading plans to allow grading and location of detention ponds within the existing utility easement(s).
23. A maintenance agreement for permanent stormwater measures in the East Tributary will be required. If the developer desires reimbursement for the construction costs and for the County to maintain the improvements, the process in the DCM needs to be followed (reference DCM Sections 1.7 and 3.3).
24. See redlined report and plans for clarification of these comments and further minor comments.

Grading and Erosion Control Plan **(cursory comments)**

1. Provide all required checklist items, specifically items 16, 18 and 19 (see attachment). See redlines for additional cursory comments.
2. Provide final design plans, profiles and details, including maintenance access, for all drainage pipes, ponds, diversion channels and other facilities necessary for long-term drainage functions. Where interim ponds will be converted to permanent ponds in the future, add the final ultimate designs and label them as “for information” or other appropriate notation.
3. The interim pond outlet designs appear to be creating permanent pools that are much larger than standard micropools and do not provide the required screening design, which will create access and maintenance issues. Revise as appropriate for long-term functioning of these ponds.
4. Provide cross sections for all diversion swales, channels, and spillways showing flow details, freeboard, channel lining materials and easements.
5. Show and label the existing, proposed CLOMR and future developed floodplains.
6. Due to the large area proposed to be graded, additional temporary sediment basins (TSBs) and appropriate pond outfalls need to be provided. If sedimentation is accounted for in the proposed detention/FSD ponds, forebays sized accordingly need to be provided for maintenance.
7. The drainage reports show soil types not amenable to vegetation (clay loams) in portions of the site. If topsoil needs to be imported, address that with a note.
8. If the interim ponds to the east are to be included with the Phase 1 overlot grading, include in the Phase 1 construction limits and show haul road and pond overflow channel locations and details. See drainage report comments regarding accommodation of historic flows.
9. A Floodplain Development Permit will be required for the proposed fill in the floodplain and any necessary East Tributary channel improvements to be included in Phase 1.
10. Offsite grading/construction/access easements appear to be necessary, at least along the north property boundary and the MVEA parcel where grading is shown at the property lines; provide when available.
11. Additional, more detailed comments will be provided after revisions to the PUDSP follow through to the GEC plan.

Financial Assurances Estimate Form / BMP/Pond Maintenance Agreement / Other

1. The Financial Assurance Estimate was not reviewed in detail at this time; additional comments will be provided on the next submittal.
	1. Provide all BMPs required by the GEC plan comments.
	2. Note: A separate FAE will be required to be approved and collateral provided prior to any work in the Phase 2 area.
2. A detention pond maintenance agreement(s) will be required for the proposed interim ponds (if they are still proposed). A template will be provided with the next submittal.

**PIKES PEAK REGIONAL BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

**Enumerations**

Would it be possible to fit all phases on 1 larger sheet 24 x 34 for addressing purposed. The multipole separate large sheets makes it difficult to see the entire area to address.

Enumerations has received the comments from El Paso/Teller County E-911 regarding the street names.

Development plan standard comments: For Tract and lot addressing place (xxxx) where they intend to be utilized.

Contact Enumerations department for addressing. Amy@pprbd.org.

**Floodplain**

Floodplain comments will be late due to the Thanks Giving Day holiday. Keith Curtis is out of town. Please contact him after 11-28-16. keith@pprbd.org

**EL PASO COUNTY TELLER 911**

Antak Dr is not needed as it is a logical continuation of Pigeon.

Lorson BLVD is shown going both N/S and E/W. Please choose another name for either portion.

The following road names have been reserved for this project:

Abita Dr

Aliso Dr

Ballona Dr

Chaplin Dr

Clarion Dr

Edisto Dr

Halifax Dr

Horton Dr

Lamine Dr

Lamprey Dr

Leatherwood Dr

Matta Dr

Mumford Dr

Napa Dr

Nash Dr

Nolin Dr

Patoka Dr

Pigeon Dr

Rockcastle Dr

Rowley Dr

Saco Dr

Shavers Dr

Skuna Dr

Tarbell Dr

Tiffin Dr

Tillamook Dr

Tolt Dr

Trappe Dr

Vedder Dr

Volga Dr

Wacissa Dr

Weiser Dr

Willapa Dr

Witcher Dr

Yacona Dr

Yamhill Dr

Yuba Dr

Zealand Dr

Fontaine BLVD is a logical continuation

ESN: 244   PSAP: EPSO        City: Security      S/E of Fontaine? Stingray

Thanks,

Connie

Street Naming

El Paso Teller County 911

elpasoteller911.org

719-785-1900

**EL PASO COMMUNITY SERVICE DEPARTMENT**

**Parks**

The Planning Division of the Community Services Department has reviewed the development application for Lorson Ranch East PUD / Preliminary Plan. This application was presented to the Park Advisory Board today and endorsed (7-0) with the recommendations below. I should note that the board had concerns about the lack of open space outside utility easements and recreation amenities. The board also suggested the applicant meet with staff to discuss since it’s a reoccurring issue. While not a condition of approval, I think there might be some merit in meeting with them. Perhaps a simple tweak to add a couple of small open space areas for future park amenities would go a long way to address the board’s concerns. Tim Wolken also spoke at the dais and offered to reach-out and see if they’d be willing to address the PAB in the near future.

The current open space dedication exceeds the 10% minimum requirement by providing 48.95 acres, or 21.7% of the site, as open space. Of this 48.95 acres being provided within Lorson Ranch East, 5.98 acres of open space were originally included with Pioneer Landing Filing No. 2 and No. 3. This acreage is being replatted with Lorson Ranch East as part of the Jimmy Camp Creek East Tributary improvements to be completed as part of this project.  Because several tracts of open space are along utility corridors, Staff encourages the applicant provide additional usable open space areas outside of utility easements, as utility infrastructure and easement restrictions may impact the amount of usable open space.

The letter of intent included language that there are no proposed recreational facilities within the project area at this time, however, future trails may be developed along the Jimmy Camp Creek East tributary, utility easements, and detention areas. Staff recommends fees in lieu of park land dedication and encourages the applicant to provide urban recreational opportunities, and to continue to develop a system of connected trails throughout Lorson Ranch for the benefit of the residents within the project area.

The Parks Master Plan shows the Fontaine Boulevard Bicycle Route running along Fontaine Boulevard. The bicycle lane exists west of the project area, and will continue within the dedicated Fontaine Boulevard right of way through Lorson Ranch East.  There are no regional trail connections within the project area. Parks staff notes that two non-County trails are shown on the PUD and Preliminary Plan, along the northern edge of the project site and along the Jimmy Camp Creek East tributary. This is consistent with the previously approved Lorson Ranch Minor Sketch Plan Amendment.

Recommended Motion for Lorson Ranch East PUD Development Plan and Preliminary Plan:

“Recommend to the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners that approval of Lorson Ranch East PUD Development Plan and Preliminary Plan include the following condition: Require fees in lieu of land for regional park purposes in the amount of $281,568 and urban fees in the amount of $177,656. A park lands agreement may be an acceptable alternative to urban park fees provided the agreement is approved by the County and executed prior to recording the final plat. Encourage the applicant to provide additional usable open space areas outside of utility easements, as utility infrastructure and easement restrictions may impact the amount of usable open space. Encourage the applicant to provide urban recreational opportunities, and to continue to develop a system of connected trails throughout Lorson Ranch for the benefit of the residents within the project area.”

Jason B Meyer
Project Manager
El Paso County Community Services Department
Planning Division
2002 Creek Crossing
Colorado Springs, CO 80905

Office: 719.520.6985, Cell: 719.499.1806
jasonmeyer@elpasoco.com

**Environmental**

The El Paso County Environmental Division has completed its review of the above referenced application. Our review consisted of the following items: wetlands, federal and state listed threatened or endangered species, general wildlife resources and noxious weeds.

1. As referenced in the submittal the Letter of Map Revision / Conditional Letter of Map Revision and 404 Permit process will determine wetland impacts and mitigation. Prior to project commencement a completed U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USCOE) permit shall be provided to the Planning and Community Development Department if ground-disturbing activities will occur in wetland areas. Alternatively, a letter from a qualified wetland scientist indicating why such a permit is not required for this project will be acceptable. The applicant is hereby on notice that the USCOE has regulatory jurisdiction over wetlands. It is the applicant’s responsibility, and not El Paso County’s, to ensure compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, including, but not limited to, the Clean Water Act.
2. As referenced in the submittal designated critical habitat does not exist within the project area; however the assumption as stated that therefore no rare or threatened species were found to be present is flawed. Prior to project commencement, documentation from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) shall be provided to the Planning and Community Development Department where the project will result in ground disturbing activity in habitat occupied or potentially occupied by threatened or endangered species and/or where development will occur within 300 feet of the centerline of a stream or within 300 feet of the 100 year floodplain, whichever is greater. The applicant is hereby on notice that the USFWS has regulatory jurisdiction over threatened and endangered species and migratory birds, respectively. It is the applicant’s responsibility, and not El Paso County’s, to ensure compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, including but not limited to, the Endangered Species Act and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.
3. The project may interfere with, scaled quail, swift fox, and mule deer habitat. Information regarding wildlife protection measures shall be provided including fencing requirements, garbage containment, and riparian/wetland protection/buffer zones, as appropriate. Information can be obtained from Colorado Parks and Wildlife.
4. The project lies within or adjacent to an area with documented noxious weeds including myrtle spurge, Canada thistle, dames rocket, Russian olive, bouncingbet, and hoarycress. Prior to project commencement a Noxious Weed Management Plan shall be provided to the Planning and Community Development Department for any Colorado listed noxious weed species present on the development site. It is the applicant’s responsibility, and not El Paso County’s, to ensure compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, including but not limited to the Colorado Noxious Weed Act and the El Paso County Weed Management Plan.

It is strongly recommended that the applicant obtain the necessary approvals from all federal, state and county agencies as a part of their planning process.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this project. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at (719) 520-7879.

**EL PASO COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT**

Manzanst and Midway soils have a high shrink/swell capability which limits dwellings with basements.

**CITY OF FOUNTAIN**

**Engineering Division**

The City of Fountain Engineering Department reviews plans and reports to ensure general conformance with the adopted standards and criteria. The engineering consultant is responsible for compliance with all applicable criteria, including other governmental regulations. Notwithstanding anything depicted in the plan in words or graphic representation, all design and construction related to roads, storm drainage, and erosion control shall conform to the standards and requirements of the most recent version of the relevant adopted criteria the City of Colorado Springs Drainage Criteria Manual, and the Drainage Criteria Manual Volume 2. Any modifications necessary to meet overlooked criteria after-the-fact will be the developer’s responsibility to rectify.

The following are Engineering Department comments regarding the submitted documents for the subject application. A written response to all comments is required for review of the re-submittal. Additional comments may be generated on items added or altered after the original comments.

**Traffic Study**

1. The City of Fountain would prefer that no future connectivity to Heritage Rd. or any arterials to the south, as this would impact the southerly subdivisions of Apple Ridge and Peaceful Valley.

**Drainage Report**

1. The City of Fountain requests that the Lorson Ranch East PUD maintains and controls all surface and subsurface waters to the planned conveyance systems and detention facilities in the planned development and should minimize discharge of any said waters to The City of Fountain property.

**COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

1. Big picture CDOT concern is with erosion/sediment transport downstream to SH-21 (Powers Blvd).
2. The C factor used for developed conditions seems low at only 0.49 and 0.65.
3. Need details on how slopes will be protected from erosion where the slopes drain offsite.
4. Need details on erosion mitigation at the pond outlets.
5. Show in a table the pre and post development flows at the ultimate discharge points to the creek.
6. Report is preliminary, please re-submit the next revision when available.

The developer is free to contact me directly with any questions or concerns.

Andy Stecklein

Region 2 North Program Hydraulics Engineer - Project Manager

P 719.227.3264 I Cell 719.659.8216 I F 719.227.3298

1480 Quail Lake Loop., Colorado Springs, CO  80906

Andrew.Stecklein@state.co.us |  [www.coloradodot.info](http://www.coloradodot.info/)  |  [www.cotrip.org](http://www.cotrip.org/)

**COLORADO DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES**

We have received the above-referenced proposal to subdivide a 225.76 acre tract of land into 838 single family lots and 48.95 acres of open space. According to the submittal, the proposed supply of water and wastewater disposal is to be served by the Widefield Water and Sanitation District (“District”).

**Water Supply Demand**

The Water Supply Information Summary, Form No. GWS-76, provided with the submittal estimates a demand of 293.32 acre-feet/year for 838 household units. This equates to an anticipated water demand of 0.35 acre-feet/year per household. The proposal does not clearly define the amount of lawn and garden irrigation anticipated for each lot. The subdivision also includes 0.706 acres of irrigated median landscaping which is anticipated to require 1.75 acre- feet/year. The total subdivision estimated water demand is 295.07 acre-feet.

Please note that standard water use rates, as found in the Guide to Colorado Well Permits, Water Rights, and Water Administration, are 0.3 acre-foot/year for each ordinary household,

0.05 acre-foot/year for four large domestic animals, and 0.05 acre-foot/year for each 1,000 square feet of lawn and garden irrigation.

**Source of Water Supply**

The source of water for the proposed development is to be served by the Widefield Water and Sanitation District (“Widefield”). A letter of commitment dated October 4, 2016 from Widefield

was provided with the supplemental materials and indicates 295.07 acre-feet are committed to the subdivision.

 **State Engineer’s Office Opinion**

According to this office’s records, it appears Widefield has sufficient water resources to serve the proposed development. Based upon the above and pursuant to Section 30-28-136(1)(h)(II), C.R.S., it is the opinion of this office that the proposed water supply is adequate and can be provided without causing injury to decreed water rights. Should you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me directly.

Sincerely,



Ivan Franco, P.E.

Water Resource Engineer

**MOUNTAIN VIEW ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, Inc.**

This area is within MVEA certificated service area. MVEA will serve this area according to our extension policy. Connection requirements may include provisions for necessary line extensions and or other system improvements, and payment of all fees under MVEA line extension policy. Information concerning these requirements can be obtained by contacting the Engineering Department of MVEA.

MVEA is currently working with the developer on the need for future access from the future Fontaine Blvd to the existing MVEA substation by large semi-trucks for maintenance and replacement of large substation equipment if ever needed. See the included Google screenshot. Local maintenance trucks will continue to access the substation from the west residential streets with the option to use the new access when provided.

MVEA requests utility easements in line with earlier filings at Lorson Ranch of ten

(10) foot front lot, five (5) foot side lot utility easement,and ten (10) foot rear lot line easement. MVEA also requests a twenty (20) foot exterior easement on plat and the platting of existing MVEA facilities with easement. If open space, drainage and landscape tracts are designed in this subdivision MVEA requests these areas be listed to include utilities. Additional easements may be required in order to serve this development.

MVEA has existing facilities within this parcel of land. If there is any removal or relocation of facilities it will be at the expense of the applicant.

Mountain View will require that the owner or developer of this project coordinate with it and the El Paso County concerning the location of any roads or other public improvements that it constructs, including any offsite modifications to existing roads or other public improvements, in order that arrangements can be made, in advance of entering into any construction contracts affecting such facilities, to complete any necessary relocation of Mountain View facilities prior to construction of said improvements, all in accordance with Colorado law and Mountain View's published policies and Bylaws. Mountain View will not proceed to relocate any facilities until after such coordination is complete and Mountain View has been paid those relocation costs that are properly owned it under its published policies and Bylaws and Colorado law

If additional information is required, please contact our office at (719) 495-2283.

Sincerely,

Cathy Hansen-Lee

Engineering Administrative Assistant

**U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE**

No comment.

Brian C. Sanchez

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Environmental Contaminants Program
Colorado Field Office - Lakewood
Phone: 303-236-4752

**WIDEFIELD SCHOOL DISTRICT 3**

This plan works very well with Widefield School District #3's plan for the development of implementation of an upcoming Bond Issue that Widefield will take to the voters next November. This development plan will hopefully put the needed infrastructure and road access to the school site before the Bond Issue is voted on. We look forward to this phase moving forward and Widefield School District #3 has no objections to this plan.

If you have further question please feel free to call me at 719-391-3531.

Thank you,

Dennis Neal

Chief Operations Officer Widefield School District #3

Comments received from any of the above non-responding agencies following the issuance of this letter will be forwarded to the applicant/applicant’s representative and will be added to the end of this letter for record keeping purposes.

**Due to the number of comments and necessary revisions to the plan(s) an additional detailed review will be necessary. Please address the comments as listed above. A detailed letter needs to accompany the revisions to allow for an expeditious re-review timeframe. The letter should include each comment listed above and, immediately thereafter, include a response from the applicant addressing the comment.**

**If any review agency has an issue that needs resolution or requires a revision, you will need to provide the necessary documents, drawings, etc., to the Planning and Community Development Department in the form of a resubmittal. The Planning and Community Development Department will then forward the resubmitted items directly to the appropriate review agency. If you have any questions pertaining to specific agency comments please contact the appropriate agency directly.**

**PLEASE NOTE: The application cannot be scheduled for public hearing until and unless a final response has been received by Planning and Community Development from those agencies that are required (pursuant to state statute and the El Paso County Land Development Code) to provide such response (i.e.- State Engineer’s Office, County Attorney’s Office, County Health Department, etc).**

Please contact me if you would like to schedule a meeting with myself or the multi-disciplinary team. When all the comments have been addressed and corrections made please submit 9 LOI’s, response letters, MAPS (2 full size only / 7 reduced), 5 Engineering Reports of each documents as requested.

If you have any questions feel free to contact me at 520-6306.

Best Regards,

*Kari Parsons*

El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department

cc: Jeff Rice PE, Engineering

File:PUDSP-16-003

**Attachments:** MDDP, PDR and GEC Review Checklists

 Redlined Preliminary Plan/PUD DP

 Redlined Drainage Reports

 Redlined Grading and Erosion Control Plan

Master Development Drainage Plan (MDDP) Checklist

The purpose of the MDDP is to identify major drainageways, ponding/detention areas, and locations of culverts, bridges, open channels and drainage areas that are tributary to the proposed development. Phased developments greater than 10 acres must submit a MDDP. The MDDP should present alternate solutions to drainage problems, which may have been identified by the Drainage Basin Planning Study. The ability of downstream drainage facilities to pass developed runoff from the proposed development must be thoroughly analyzed in the MDDP. The report shall include but not be limited to the following information and calculations:

**Report Contents**

1. Table of contents, pages numbered. [x]
2. Location and description of the proposed development stating the proposed

 land use acreage and adjacent features to the site. [x]

1. Calculations for design peak flows from all offsite tributary drainage areas. [ ]
2. Calculations for design peak flows within the proposed development for all

 drainage areas. [x]

1. Discussion and analysis of existing and proposed downstream facilities. [ ]
2. Discussion of drainage problems anticipated within and downstream of the

 development and their solutions. [ ]

**Drawing Contents**

1. The following scales may be used to show the entire development and all

 offsite drainage areas, 1”=50’ to 1”=400’. [x]

1. Any and all floodplains must be identified. [ ]
2. Existing topography. [x]
3. Location and approximate size of open channels, bridges, culverts,

 storm sewers and ponding areas. [ ]

1. Identification of all drainage areas tributary to the development. [ ]
2. Identification of drainage areas within the development. [x]
3. Location of all streets classified higher than residential. [x]

**Preliminary Drainage Report (PDR) Checklist**

The purpose of the Preliminary Drainage Report is to identify specific solutions to problems onsite and offsite resulting from the development of the subdivision to be platted. In addition, those problems that exist prior to development must be addressed in the preliminary report. The PDR shall be in accordance with the following outline and contain the applicable information listed. Drainage reports must utilize the following format and major headings as noted below.

**Report Contents**

1. Table of contents, pages numbered. [x]

***General Location***

1. City and County, and local streets within and adjacent to the subdivision. [x]
2. Township, range, section, ¼ section. [x]
3. Major drainageways and existing facilities. [ ]
4. Names or surrounding platted developments. [x]

***Description of Property***

1. Area in acres. [x]
2. Ground cover (type of trees, shrubs, vegetation). [x]
3. General topography. [x]
4. General soil conditions. [x]
5. Major drainageways. [ ]
6. Irrigation facilities. [x]
7. Utilities and other encumbrances. [x]

***Major Basin Descriptions***

1. Reference should be made to major drainageway planning studies; [ ]

 such as drainage basin planning studies, flood hazard delineation reports,

 and flood insurance studies or maps, if available.

1. A floodplain statement shall be provided indicating whether any portion of [x]

 the development is in a designated floodplain as delineated on the current

 FEMA mapping.

1. Major basin drainage characteristics. [ ]
2. Identification of all nearby irrigation facilities and other obstructions which

 could influence or be influenced by the local drainage. [x]

***Sub-Basin Description***

1. Discussion of historic drainage patterns of the property in question. [x]
2. Discussion of offsite drainage flow patterns and their impact on the

 development. [x]

***Drainage Design Criteria***

1. Reference all criteria, master plans, and technical information used for [x]

 report preparation and design; any deviation from such material must be

 discussed and justified.

1. Discussion of previous drainage studies (i.e. PDR, drainage basin planning **[ ]**

 studies, master plans, flood insurance studies) for the site in question that

 influence or are influenced by the drainage design and how the studies

 affect drainage design for the site.

***Hydrologic Criteria***

1. Identify design rainfall. [ ]
2. Identify runoff calculation method. [ ]
3. Identify design storm recurrence intervals. [ ]
4. Identify detention discharge and storage calculation method. [ ]

***Drainage Facility Design – General Concept***

1. Discussion of compliance with offsite runoff considerations. [ ]
2. Discussion of anticipated and proposed drainage patterns. [ ]
3. Discussion of the content of tables, charts, figures, plates or drawings

 presented in the report. [ ]

***Drainage Facility Design – Specific Details***

1. Presentation of **existing and proposed** hydrologic conditions including [ ]

approximate flow rates entering and exiting the subdivision with all

necessary calculations.

1. Presentation of approach to accommodate drainage impacts on existing or [ ]

 proposed improvements and facilities.

1. Presentation of proposed facilities with respect to alignment, material and [ ]

 structure type.

1. Discussion of drainage impact of site constraints such as streets, utilities, [ ]

 existing and proposed structures.

1. Environmental features and issues shall be presented if applicable. [ ]
2. Discussion of maintenance access and aspects of the preliminary design. [ ]
3. Discussion and analysis of existing and proposed downstream drainage [ ]

 facilities and their ability to convey developed runoff from the proposed

 development.

**Drawing Contents**

1. General Location Map: A map shall be provided in sufficient detail to [x]

 identify drainage flows entering and leaving the development and general

 drainage patterns. The map should be at a scale of 1”=50’ to 1”=2000’.

 The map shall identify any major construction (i.e. development, irrigation

 ditches, existing detention facilities, culverts, storm sewers, etc.) that shall

 influence or be influenced by the subdivision.

1. Drainage Plan: Map(s) of the proposed development at a scale of 1”=20’ [ ]

 to 1”=200’ shall be included to identify existing and proposed conditions on

 or adjacent to the site in question.

1. The drainage plan shall delineate all sub-basins and proposed initial [ ]

 and major facilities as well as provide a summary of all initial and major

 flow rates at design points. All floodplains affecting the site shall be shown.

El Paso County Grading and Erosion Control Plan Submittal Checklist

1. Vicinity map. [ ]
2. North arrow and acceptable scale (1”=20’ to 1”=100’). [ ]
3. Existing and proposed Contours 2 feet or less (except for hillside). [ ]
4. Standard EPC Grading and Erosion Control Notes included. [ ]
5. Delineate mapped FEMA 100-yr floodplain. [ ]
6. Construction site boundaries clearly delineated. [ ]
7. Areas of soil disturbance shown. [ ]
8. All proposed construction BMPs and Construction BMP details shown. [ ]
9. Show existing vegetation. [ ]
10. Existing and proposed water courses including springs, streams, wetlands, Detention ponds, roadside ditches, irrigation ditches and other water surfaces. [ ]
11. Show all existing structures. [ ]
12. Show all existing utilities. [ ]
13. Submit geotechnical investigation from soils engineer. [ ]
14. Conclusions from soils report and geologic hazards report incorporated in grading design. [ ]
15. Show existing and proposed property lines and site boundary. [ ]
16. All existing and proposed easements (permanent and construction).including required off site easements. [ ]
17. Any offsite grading clearly shown and called out. [ ]
18. Existing and proposed storm drainage facilities as necessary to show all BMPs. [ ]
19. Temporary sediment ponds provided for disturbed drainage areas greater than one acre. [ ]
20. Proposed slopes steeper than 3:1 with top and toe of slope delineated. [ ]
21. Erosion control blanketing shown on slopes steeper than 3:1. [ ]
22. Retaining walls greater than or equal to 4ft in height require design by P.E. and building permit from Regional Building Department. Locations to be shown on the plan (not located in County ROW). [ ]
23. Vehicle tracking shown at all construction entrances. [ ]
24. The erosion control plan is to be certified by a Colorado Registered P.E. with appropriate signature blocks for EPC and the Engineer and the statement “The Owner will comply with the requirements of the Erosion Control Plan” signed by the owner. [ ]
25. Required Signature blocks: [ ]