



Planning and Community
Development Department
2880 International Circle
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80910
Phone: 719.520.6300
Fax: 719.520.6695
Website www.elpasoco.com

DEVIATION REQUEST AND DECISION FORM

Updated: 6/26/2019

PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Name :	Prairie Heights Elementary School Expansion
Schedule No.(s) :	5728004015
Legal Description :	LOT 110 MIDWAY RANCHES FIL NO 7 TOG WITH THAT POR OF VACATED INDIAN VILLAGE HEIGHTS

APPLICANT INFORMATION


Company :	Kiowa Engineering
Name :	Matthew Erichsen
	☐ Owner ☒ Consultant ☐ Contractor
Mailing Address :	7222 Commerce Center Suite 260, CS, CO 80919
Phone Number :	303-835-7421
FAX Number :	
Email Address :	merichsen@kiowaengineering.com

ENGINEER INFORMATION


Company :	Kiowa Engineering	Colorado P.E. Number :	33365
Name :	Matthew Erichsen		
Mailing Address :	7222 Commerce Center Suite 260, CS, CO 80919		
Phone Number :	303-835-7421		
FAX Number :			
Email Address :	merichsen@kiowaengineering.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 condition(s) of approval.

 Mark McPherson, Superintendent July 14, 2026
Signature of owner (or authorized representative) Date

Engineer's Seal, Signature
And Date of Signature



DEVIATION REQUEST (Attach diagrams, figures, and other documentation to clarify request)

A deviation from the standards of or in Section **Chapter 2, Paragraph 2.4.1** of the Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM) is requested.

Identify the specific ECM standard which a deviation is requested:

Engineering Criteria Manual chapter 2, paragraph 2.4.1. Access Design Criteria, E. Access Width., 3. Two-Way Commercial or Industrial Access Points, For Nonresidential Collector Roadways: A maximum 40-foot access width.

State the reason for the requested deviation:

A 51-ft wide driveway is requested for the entrance to the site. This width will allow the east side of the entrance to line up with the east edge of asphalt of the interior drive aisle, resulting in a 90 degree right turn into the site instead of a "u-turn" type entry to the site if the east edge of the access was located further west (like originally designed). This is important to the school district due to the varying skill level of the drivers and keeping it simpler for all of the bus drivers who will be making this turn when other vehicles are present. The west edge of the access was initially laid out at 40-ft however was modified to 51-ft to provide an opportunity for the buses to be closer to a 90 degree angle at the road and improve the bus turning radii.

-Bus and fire truck turning movements through the access have been confirmed.

-The property frontage is too narrow (119.55') for two separate driveways. Additional width is required for the layout including the bus turning radii.

Explain the proposed alternative and compare to the ECM standards (May provide applicable regional or national standards used as basis):

A raised median within the site is provided to separate the in and the out direction with signage indicating "DO NOT ENTER" and "KEEP RIGHT" in accordance with MUTCD.

Alternative configurations were considered, including use of neighboring driveways. However, that option would require obtaining easements from adjacent properties, which is not practical. Specifically, an easement from the adjacent fire department property could conflict with emergency vehicle operations and create safety concerns.

Another option reviewed included a wider overall entrance with a large median in the center to separate the inbound and outbound traffic. It would also narrow both inbound and outbound lanes to 20-ft. It was determined that this overall width would be too wide for the entrance.

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.
- ☒ 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.
- ☐ 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:

The project site has limited frontage along Indian Village Heights of approximately 119.55 feet. This frontage is insufficient to provide two separate driveways while maintaining required spacing, turning radii for school buses, and safe internal circulation. The proposed wider combined access provides a functional equivalent to separate ingress/egress movements while fitting within the constrained site geometry. The design maintains clear channelization and does not compromise emergency access or pedestrian safety.

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.

The proposed 51-foot access MUTCD-compliant signage along the interior median provides clear separation of inbound and outbound traffic, equivalent to (or better than) two separate narrower accesses. It safely accommodates school bus turning movements and internal site circulation while fitting the narrow frontage. Hanover Fire Protection District has reviewed and approved the new access layout.

The deviation will not adversely affect safety or operations.

A raised median physically separates entering and exiting traffic. "DO NOT ENTER" and "KEEP RIGHT" signage (per MUTCD) prevents wrong-way movements. The design supports low-volume bus traffic with minimal conflict points. Sight distance and turning radii are maintained or improved.

The deviation will not adversely affect maintenance and its associated cost.

The raised median interior to the site and access pavement will be maintained by the property owner (Hanover School District 28). No additional maintenance burden is placed on the County. Materials and construction meet or exceed standard ECM requirements.

The deviation will not adversely affect aesthetic appearance.

The raised median can be landscaped consistent with the overall site landscaping plan to enhance appearance. The median is currently designed to be concrete pavement. The overall access design integrates with the school site improvements and surrounding context.

The deviation meets the design intent and purpose of the ECM standards.

The intent of the access width standard is to provide safe and efficient access. The proposed design achieves this through channelization, signage, and median separation while addressing site-specific constraints.

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.

Yes — stormwater controls (e.g., curb inlets, grading) are incorporated into the site plan and will not be impacted by the access design.

REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION:

Approved by the ECM Administrator

This request has been determined to have met the criteria for approval. A deviation from Section _____ of the ECM is hereby granted based on the justification provided.

┌

┐

└

┘

Denied by the ECM Administrator

This request has been determined not to have met criteria for approval. A deviation from Section _____ of the ECM is hereby denied.

┌

┐

└

┘

ECM ADMINISTRATOR COMMENTS/CONDITIONS:

--

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.

