

Avolve Software

21001 N Tatum Blvd
STE 1630-503
Phoenix, AZ 85050, USA



Comment Correction Required / Response Report

Application No. PDZL-24-0005

Submission Documents:

Document Name	Document ID
241010_BLR Village C Project Statement.pdf	15826011
BLR Land Dedication 08.06.2024.pdf	15825994
Banning Lewis Ranch Village C - Traffic Impact Study_Oct2024.pdf	15825997
VILLAGE C LEGAL.pdf	15825995
241010_BLR Village C Land Use Plan.pdf	15825956
241010_BLR Village C_Land Use Plan_Authorization Form.pdf	15826001

Comment Author Contact Information:

Author Name	Author Email	Author Phone No.:
Tamara Baxter	Tamara.Baxter@coloradosprings.gov	-
Zaker Alazzeah	Zaker.Alazzeah@coloradosprings.gov	-
Caroline Miller	Caroline.Miller@coloradosprings.gov	719-385-6089
Allison Stocker	Allison.Stocker@coloradosprings.gov	-
Joel Dagnillo	Joel.Dagnillo@coloradosprings.gov	-
Teresa Guagliardo	teresa.guagliardo@state.co.us	-
Jonathan Scherer	Jonathan.Scherer@coloradosprings.gov	-

General Comments

Comment ID	Author : Department	Status	Review Comments	Applicant Response Comments
20	Teresa Guagliardo : CDOT	Open	Please refer to email sent to Tamara Baxter on 11-1-2024.	RESPONSE: Noted.

Comment ID	Author : Department	Status	Review Comments	Applicant Response Comments
14	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	Open	Info Only: Please contact the Lead Reviewer, Jonathan Scherer (jonathan.scherer@coloradosprings.gov), with any questions. Please reference the Planning review number in all communications.	RESPONSE: Noted.

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

Comment ID	Page Reference	Annotation Type	Author : Department	Status	Review Comments	Applicant Response Comments
3	1	Note	Zaker Alazzeh : City Eng - Traffic Engineering	Open	1- Include the proposed traffic in the master traffic impact study prepared by LSC for Banning Lewis Ranch Villages A-D. 2- Include the proposed traffic in the updated master traffic impact study prepared by SM ROCHA for Percheron. 3- Analyze intersections 9 & 10 with a roundabout control. 4- The city is not aware of intersection 11 connection to HWY 24. Please confirm with CDOT if this connection will ever be allowed. 5- For 2044 analysis, Please analyze Dublin Blvd to be connected to HWY 24. 6- For 2044 analysis, Please analyze Stetson Hills Blvd to be connected to Marksheffel Road. 7- Stetson Hills Blvd will need to be analyzed as four lanes cross-section for 2044 analysis. 8- Analyze Banning Lewis Parkway to be connected south of Stetson Hills Blvd for 2044 analysis.	RESPONSE: Please see included T.I.S comment response letters from S.M. Rocha dated March 26, 2025.
2	2	Note	Zaker Alazzeh : City Eng - Traffic Engineering	Open	1- The developer shall dedicate appropriate ROW along northern property line of Parcel 6 side at Dublin Blvd. This dedication must be consistent with the western property line ROW. 2- Please update the traffic study. Details are shown in the traffic impact study review comments.	RESPONSE: Please see included T.I.S comment response letters from S.M. Rocha dated March 26, 2025.
15	1	Free Text	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	Open	Show and label all major drainageways on the vicinity map.	RESPONSE: Added.
16	1	Free Text	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	Open	In the Floodplain Statement, include which flood zone the Site lies within (e.g. Zone X).	RESPONSE Added.
17	1	Free Text	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	Open	The Site also appears to be located within Panel 08041C0561G. Please include within the Floodplain Statement.	RESPONSE Added.
18	1	Free Text	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	Open	Add a note calling out channel improvement requirements associated with this Site. Include responsible party, long-term maintenance responsibility (private/public), and timing requirements.	RESPONSE
19	2	Callout	Jonathan Scherer : City Engineering - SWENT	Open	Will water quality treatment also be provided?	RESPONSE Yes conceptual ponds will be for water quality purposes. Location of ponds will be

Comment ID	Page Reference	Annotation Type	Author : Department	Status	Review Comments	Applicant Response Comments
						determined at time of development plan.
28	1	Callout	Joel Dagnillo : City Engineering Dev Review	Open	Remove	RESPONSE Removed.
29	1	Callout	Joel Dagnillo : City Engineering Dev Review	Open	Add a note stating the timeline in which Dublin and Stetson Hills will be constructed	RESPONSE See note #22. The timeline for Stetson Hills and Dublin to be completed to highway 24 is dependent on numerous factors including development pace and adjacent property owners. As such the developer will follow the guidance of the TIS for Banning Lewis Ranch Village C for adjacent roadway construction completion.
26	2	Note	Joel Dagnillo : City Engineering Dev Review	Open	All public improvements to be built to City Standards, and specifically called out as so on forthcoming Development Plan(s). Construction plans and financial assurances will also be required as this project progresses.	RESPONSE: Noted.
27	2	Note	Joel Dagnillo : City Engineering Dev Review	Open	Call out roadway classification of Future Road A and B.	RESPONSE: Updated
55	1	Note	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Refer to CDOT comments dated 11/1/24, CDOT Traffic Review comments, and US 24 Garrett Woodman Traffic Report provided by CDOT. All have been uploaded seperately.	RESPONSE: Please see included T.I.S comment response letters from S.M. Rocha dated March 26, 2025.
58	1	Note	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Please refer to comments provided on this document with city file PDZZ-24-0003.	RESPONSE: Noted.
5	1	Note	Allison Stocker : Planning	Open	Note 15 is redundant as this information is already noted in Note 3	RESPONSE: Updated.
13	1	Note	Allison Stocker : Planning	Open	What community benefits are being provided as a part of the PDZ zoning? See Section 7.2.7 for options. Community amenities could be possibly satisfied by providing a high-quality network of trails throughout the development and along the streams (in addition to Rock Island), but you will need to clear all options with the case planner.	RESPONSE: Zoning has been revised to R-flex Medium and MX-M per recommendation of planning staff.
21	1	Note	Allison Stocker : Planning	Open	Please add that inclusion of lots and tracts within the SS-O will be determined at time of development plan review.	RESPONSE: Updated.
25	1	Note	Allison Stocker : Planning	Open	SS-O review may have additional comments as new information is provided.	RESPONSE Noted.

31	1	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	<p>PLDO Reviewer would like for Village B2 and C to go to Parks Advisory Board prior to City Planning Commission to highlight PLDO obligations through the Master Plan/Land Use Plan and how they are to be met through the spread of Neighborhood Parks and summed Village C Community Park site. This will take two months, the first month as a presentation item, the second month as an action item, once Parks comments are resolved on Village C.</p> <p>In addition, the PRCS Department acknowledges receipt of the latest Alternative Compliance</p>	RESPONSE: Noted.
Comment ID	Page Reference	Annotation Type	Author : Department	Status	Review Comments	Applicant Response Comments
					Agreement Proposal submitted directly to the PRCS Department. This is under a separate review by the PRCS Department. We will respond accordingly and in alignment with the Planning PLDO comments being addressed.	
50	1	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Note 8 can be removed as it has been reflected in Park Note edits. However - Please confirm, is this also the intention of the Community Park, to be built by the developer and dedicated and maintained by a District? Or built by the developer and dedicated to PRCS? This as a whole is a part of PRCS PLDO discussions and will need to be agreed upon with the Parks Department.	RESPONSE Note 8 removed
51	1	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Please move first sentence of Note 24 and Note 25 to the Park Notes on Page 2. Please remove second sentence of Note 24 as it no longer reflects full PLDO code.	RESPONSE Updated
53	1	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Please add a note specifying how the School Site Dedications are to be met, in alignment with D49 comments.	RESPONSE See note #22
59	1	Note	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Please make sure the legal description is updated per city comments provided	RESPONSE: Revised
60	1	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Please verify TSN provided.	RESPONSE They appear correct
61	1	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Please refer to comments made by staff on the zoning map amendment application pertaining to PDZ district	RESPONSE: Zoning has been revised to R-flex Medium and MX-M per recommendation of planning staff.
62	1	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	The property owner is not reflective of El Paso County Assessor records. Please update.	RESPONSE Updated.
63	1	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Add city file #	RESPONSE Updated.
64	1	Note	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Reference to concept plan should be changed to land use plan	RESPONSE Updated.

65	1	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Which plans and reports?	RESPONSE Note removed, no longer relevant.
66	1	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Is GN #20 at the time of development plan?	RESPONSE Note updated.
67	1	Note	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Since Master Plans and Concept plans are not Land Use Plans, for BLR MP, please include a sheet that reflects the BLR Master Plan, clouding the area of change. Also, include legend that reflects land use areas. Refer to City file CPC MP 87-00381-A22MJ18	RESPONSE: Sheet has been added please see sheet number 5 of 10.
12	2	Callout	Allison Stocker : Planning	Open	Please label Creek	RESPONSE Labeled.
Comment ID	Page Reference	Annotation Type	Author : Department	Status	Review Comments	Applicant Response Comments
33	2	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Informational - Citywide Development Impact (Police & Fire) Fees will be applicable for this Land Use Plan area, though staff will be working with Fire to understand the Public Safety area and feedback by Fire staff, as it pertains to 7.5.532.F.4. Future conversation, comments, and notes will be incoming.	RESPONSE Noted
34	2	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Please remove all fee columns, as these fees are not a complete picture and are subject to change more significantly than estimated acreage obligated.	RESPONSE Removed

35	2	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	<p>Please revise Park Notes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Units shown reflect the average density reflected in this Land Use Plan. If there are future additional PLDO obligations, ordinance fulfillment may be completed administratively. 2. The Neighborhood Park Land obligation (12.151 acres) is to be satisfied through three park sites of at least 3.5 acres each. Park sites should be relatively flat and developable, without being encumbered by easements. Stormwater detention areas cannot count towards PLDO dedications. 3. The three neighborhood parks will be built by the developer, then owned and maintained by one of the following Banning Lewis Ranch Metro Districts 9, 10, 11. The neighborhood park land should meet the requirements of City Code 7.4.307.F to include: An Alternative Compliance agreement made with the Parks Department prior to the park plat, the Neighborhood Park Site designs are subject to the Parks Advisory Board review and recommendation prior to construction, and that the land is permanently designated for parks purposes through PK Zoning, easement, deed restriction, or covenant. Neighborhood Park construction shall be completed at the time 50% of the building permits adjacent development have been pulled. 4. The Community Park Land obligation (14.728 acres) is to be satisfied with the summed Community Park Site of Village A, B2, and C obligations. If for any reason, satisfactory park land cannot be provided to meet the Village C obligation, the Master Developer will owe fees in lieu of land. Building permits may be held up until this payment is satisfied. 5. The Community Park site is intended to host athletic fields, sports courts, and park amenities, which will include lights, sound, and traffic, with site design subject to Parks Advisory Board review and recommendation prior to construction. 	RESPONSE Added.
Comment ID	Page Reference	Annotation Type	Author : Department	Status	Review Comments	Applicant Response Comments
36	2	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Informational - More Parks comments or edits are likely to be requested.	RESPONSE Noted.
37	2	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Informational - Parks Staff will be having an internal meeting on 11/8 and second meeting before Thanksgiving to discuss PRCS Alternative Compliance options and Community Park site.	RESPONSE Noted.
39	2	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Village B2 units from PDZL-24-0003 shows 2,141 units, please revise. 16.101 ac of Community acreage does match.	RESPONSE 2,141 units has been updated. 16.101 ac. Is correct based off PDZL-24-0003.
40	2	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Is this development to be phased? Please provide a phasing plan if so, see 7.5.514.C.1.a(10)	RESPONSE There is no phasing plan but generally development

						will move east to west.
42	2	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	It is staff's understanding that, in consideration of the build out of Village A, B2, and C: Village A already has homes on the ground. If Community park is approved, it is likely that Village A will not incur Community Park fees and the tail end of BLR Village B2 and C development plans run the highest chance of owing Com. Park Fees at the end of build out - by either an increase in residential units for the 3 Villages (as calculations are created with estimated average), or a decrease in available Community park acreage. Are there concerns or conversations that need to happen to address this process?	RESPONSE
44	2	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Is it presumed that there will be a drive adjacent to N.H. Park 2, to allow for nearby street parking?	RESPONSE Yes NH Park 2 will have vehicular access and street parking from parcel 3. Road layout in this area to be determined on development plan.
45	2	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Have there been considerations of moving the N.H. Park 3 east of the utility easements to serve the residential communities of Parcels 6, 7, and 8? It is still within a half mile of walking distance along the Rock Island trail which is park standard, but by vehicle park access is further. Phasing may also play a role in this.	RESPONSE We agree that there should be a park east of the utility easement. We have added a 4 th park to serve this area. We are projecting (4) 3.5 acre Neighborhood parks which exceeds the requirement projection of 12.151 acres.
46	2	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	As shown, there is a need for pedestrian bridges to allow connection to the Community Park site. Will the developer provide those?	RESPONSE Yes the developer will provide access over the drainageways to the community park. The type of crossing has not been determined.
54	2	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Please add a note that the Rock Island Trail Corridor easements will be provided to the City at time of adjacent development.	RESPONSE: Rock island trail has an existing easement that varies in width 100-200'.
68	2	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Please expand if 'dwelling - two family (duplex)' will also be allowed per UDC.	RESPONSE *Note has been added for clarification.
75	2	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Refer to Staff comments on proposed PDZ zoning, not meeting eligibility for PDZ district. Conventional zoning is encourage. Thus, density for specific parcels make need to be updated.	RESPONSE: Zoning has been revised to R-flex Medium and MX-M per recommendation of planning staff.

Comment ID	Page Reference	Annotation Type	Author : Department	Status	Review Comments	Applicant Response Comments
41	3	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Staff is concerned of the likelihood that portions of the proposed Community Park site will be impacted by streamside buffering from SS-O, potential wetland qualifications, and stormwater requirements. What is the justification that the 43 acres of this site is developable?	RESPONSE: The 43.2ac park boundary as shown is offset 50' from the center of the stream alignment, therefore most of the SS-O will be avoided. We expect some of the streamside outer buffer to fall within the park. If that occurs, then the requirements for that buffer zone will be met but we don't expect that to affect park programming. We see these areas adjacent to the channels as opportunities for nature trails and other activities. In previous meetings with staff it was said to us that wetlands and other natural features could exist within a park this size if it was highlighted within park programming.
47	3	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Initial feedback from Stormwater suggests that this bend in the channel will likely be straightened out at the time of channel improvements. How does that impact Community Park acreage?	RESPONSE: Final Community park acreage will be determined at time of development plan. Any shortfalls with the community park acreage can be addressed at that time.
48	3	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Please provide a slope % and arrow be provided on these neighborhood park graphics.	RESPONSE. Slope gradients are provided. Majority of the acreage at the proposed Community park and NH parks 2 & 3 are within the 0-5% slope (green color) category. NH park 1 has a portion within the 8-12% (dark yellow) category but that can be managed effectively. Majority of NH park 1 is less than 8 percent slope, leaving ample room for a sports field. Topography is not an issue for proposed locations, as Village C in general is very flat. We also view streams, wetlands and topography as opportunities rather than constraints for these sites. For

						instance, for a large community park, users would benefit from variation on the site. Streams, existing vegetation, wetlands & topography add interest to trails and seating areas as well as creating viewpoints and characteristic experiences throughout the park. Flat cool season grass sports areas are only one part of the expected programming for these parks.
49	3	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	Please provide a conceptual grading layer be added to this community park site. If not shown wishing to show on the Land Use Plan, please provide to staff.	RESPONSE: This is not a Land Use Plan checklist item, it is too early to provide meaningful conceptual grading without a park design in place. Although we do not see topography as an issue for the proposed sites, see response to comment 48 concerning existing grading.
11	4	Note	Allison Stocker : Planning	Open	Within the Streamside Land Use Plan criteria responses, it is noted that internal trail networks will be provided. Can you please include a conceptual network within the park map? Further refinement of that network can be dealt with during development plan review.	RESPONSE: It is too early to suggest a conceptual trails network. Extensive studying needs to be done regarding the site's constraints and opportunities in order to create a feasible trail concept plan. Ideally the trails will follow the main north-south drainage corridors and connect pedestrian access nodes, but the layout could vary significantly as development progresses. These types of trails are a discretionary amenity and not expected to count towards any park credit or alternative compliance agreement.
24	4	Note	Allison Stocker : Planning	Open	Please show conceptual points of connection between neighborhoods and parks. Further refinement can come with the future development plan.	RESPONSE: All parks are adjacent to neighborhoods and/or collector roads allowing access. Ideally supplemental pedestrian connections will occur at Neighborhood Parks 2 & 3 at the Rock Island Trail.

52	4	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	In the Park Vicinity Map, could the roads to be vacated be removed, to only show new access points?	RESPONSE Vacated roads are removed.
9	6	Note	Allison Stocker : Planning	Open	Which streams will have trails and where will they connect too?	RESPONSE Ideally the trails will follow the major north/south drainage ways. These types of trails are a discretionary amenity and not expected to count towards any park credit or alternative compliance agreement.
10	6	Note	Allison Stocker : Planning	Open	What considerations are there to protect the existing Swainson's Hawk nest?	RESPONSE: At least one migratory bird/raptor was observed within the Site during the Site assessment, a nesting Swainson's hawk. Nesting, egg laying and rearing of young are seasonal depending on the species of bird. If migratory bird or raptor species are found to be present, construction activities will need to be restricted near any active nests to ensure the avoidance of take during the nesting and fledging season (depending on the species).
69	6	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	How will they be protected?	RESPONSE Updated.
70	6	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	The response does not appear to address this criteria.	RESPONSE Updated.
71	6	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Please clarify this response to address this criteria	RESPONSE Updated.
72	6	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	add "in accordance with UDC SEction 72.603"	RESPONSE Updated.
73	6	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Please address this criteria.	RESPONSE Updated.
74	6	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	This response does not address this criteria.	RESPONSE Updated.

Comment ID	Page Reference	Annotation Type	Author : Department	Status	Review Comments	Applicant Response Comments
56	1	Note	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Please use current general application form. Also submit a statement of authority. Signatures are necessary.	RESPONSE: Submitted.
57	1	Note	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Refer to comments provided on project statement submitted with the zone change application (PDZZ-24-003)	RESPONSE: Noted.
38	1	Note	Caroline Miller : Planning	Open	What is considered as a density increase for Note 2 in consideration of the Land Use Plan? Is it proposals of greater than 8 du/ac or above a specific unit number of the Land Use Plan - are the school sites planned for the maximum possible density, or an average?	RESPONSE: The school site acreages are based on what District 49 has requested by the developer to provide. Please reach out to District 49 for clarification on how they determined these sites.
76	1	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	map was not attached. Please provide this reference map	RESPONSE: Map from 7/9/2024 is attached. For clarification, this map will show the high school campus in a different location. Subsequent conversations with District 49 staff have determined the school site locations as they are shown on the LUP. But the acreages remain consistent.
77	1	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	Is this for BLR V2 and Village C?	RESPONSE: This letter is to address all school site dedications by the developer for the remaining Banning Lewis Ranch areas, including Village B2, Village A and Village C.
78	1	Callout	Tamara Baxter : Planning	Open	The LUP shows middle school and high school. Please clarify difference.	RESPONSE: District 49 staff has stated that this site will most likely be a combined middle and high school campus.