

Planning Comments:

Revisions Required:

1. General Comments:

- a. Standard setback distances are incorrect on page C.100, please remove or revise.

Response: Landmark revised the setbacks.

2. Conditional Use: Amend the narrative to address Criteria of Approval Section 707.C.

Response: SAA has revised the narrative to address Section 707.C.

3. Section 406.C.4: Provide a maneuvering analysis, similar to those shown on page C.100, for the far north unit of the north building relative to the guest parking.

Response: The revised site plan relocates the guest parking to the south and includes turning movements for these spots.

4. Section 406.C.7: One bike rack is required.

Response: A bike rack has been added adjacent to the two guest parking spots.

5. Section 409.D.2.a: Show the proposed location of snowmelt infrastructure on the site plan, utility plan, landscaping plan and any other relevant pages to ensure that the system will achieve the intent of the standard and that there are no conflicts between snowmelt and any other infrastructure or system. The snowmelt system will need to be shown on future civil plans associated with this development.

Response: The area of proposed snowmelt concrete has been differentiated from standard concrete with a unique hatch and has been added to the site plan, utility plan and grading plan.

6. Section 418.C.2: The proposed retaining wall appears to be over 6' toward the south end of the wall. The wall needs to be redesigned to meet the standard or a variance requested.

Response: The revised plan includes a terraced retaining wall.

7. Section 437.D.1: It does not appear that the building meets this standard.

Response: Due the site being so narrow (depth of site), the parking was placed in the rear yard in order to abide by CDC Section 406 C.2.g. There is a direct conflict between the requested standard and the parking location. The Village Drive frontage has been activated with the disc golf amenity and landscaping. Also grade changes necessitate that the front doors for the complex enter at the ground level.

8. Section 437.F: The variance addresses one point in the section but there are several other standards not addressed in the narrative including snow retention, roof overhang standards and green roof standards. It's unclear if the project will meet these standards or if the variance is intended to include all roof form standards. Green roofs could minimize or mitigate the variance. Provide clarity in the variance request to indicate whether all standards are being varied or if the project intends to address any of the other standards in the section.

Response: SAA has revised the narrative to address the roof standards.

9. Section 437.G.1: Surface parking needs to be screened from Walton Creek Road.

Response: The surface parking was relocated to the south and additional landscaping was provided along Walton Creek Road.

10. Section 437.H.2.b: The north building does not appear to meet this standard. with the next submittal demonstrate the variations that are being used.

Response: The perspectives have been updated to distinguish colors and materials. The north building has implemented two of the standards: v. Distinct color variation between individual units; or vi. Distinct variations in materials between individual units.

11. Section 437.J.1: Provide information about the color of materials to be used and provide elevations or a perspective showing proposed colors; perspectives in the plan set are inconsistent.

Response: SAA has provided a color and materials board and updated and added perspectives for both buildings. Please refer to DP.32 through DP.35

Informational Comments:

1. Consider providing landscaping adjacent to and behind the proposed lighting on the east edge of the property to mitigate impacts of light on the adjacent property.

Response: Landscape has been updated to mitigate the impacts of light on the adjacent property. In addition, the light fixtures are shielded.

2. There are no mechanical, service, or accessory structures shown for this development. Structures will need to meet standards of Section 437.K if they are proposed at any point.

Response: Understood. We do not anticipate any at this time, but if any accessory structures are added, they will meet the standards of Section 437.K.

3. The development is proposed as one-phase. All improvements are required prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy. Improvements that are not critical may be completed after CO with collateral and an executed improvements agreement.

Response: Noted.

4. No comments on ENV-21-01.

Response: Noted.

Draft Conditions of Approval:

1. Sprinkler and alarm systems are required in all units prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.

Response: Per an email from Todd Carr, this project will be under the 2018 IRC, and will not require sprinklers.

2. The following items are considered critical improvements and must be constructed and approved prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy:

- a. Sidewalk improvements

Response: Noted.

- b. Snowmelt system

Response: Noted.

3. The project is approved with a snowmelt system and no designated areas for snow storage or plan for snow hauling. The snowmelt system shall be kept in operating condition in perpetuity. Any circumstance on the property other than a snowmelt system serving the entire development will require development plan approval.

Response: Noted.

Engineering Comments:

1. The Engineering Variance for driveway width can likely be supported.

Response: Noted.

2. Development Plan:

- a. The sidewalk along Walton Creek Road needs to align with the existing sidewalk on the property to the east. Additional Right of Way for Walton Creek Road is required.

Response: Section 602.E of the Community Development Code requires additional right-of-way to accommodate multi-mode facilities and to offset or mitigate the anticipated traffic impacts of the subdivision. Landmark revised the plans to include a cross section showing how the project accommodates multi-mode facilities and the City's standard cross section without dedicating additional right-of-way. Additionally, the project does not have any traffic impacts that justify the request for additional right-of-way.

- b. It appears improvements are encroaching into the utility and snow removal/storage easements. Please clarify the extents of the easements on the plan sheets.

Response: Landmark revised the plans to show the easements more clearly.

- c. Annotate the distance of the proposed driveway offset from Walton Creek Road.

Response: Landmark revised the Sheet C.100 to include the offset distance.

- d. Provide cross sections at 50 ft intervals of the proposed sidewalk reconstruction along Village Drive to show the elevation of the sidewalk with respect to the roadway and ditch elevation.

Response: Landmark added cross sections to the plans.

- e. Provide cross sections at 50 ft intervals of the proposed sidewalk along Walton Creek Road to show the elevation of the sidewalk with respect to the roadway and ditch elevation.

Response: Landmark added cross sections to the plans.

3. Traffic Study:

- a. Study needs to analyze proposed development access location with respect to Walton Creek Road. Include a discussion of the possible conflict of the driveway with the queue length of northbound Village Drive vehicles stopped at the intersection. Revise Traffic

Scope approval form and resubmit for approval prior to completing the traffic study revision.

Response: The Traffic Scope approval form was resubmitted to Stuart King and approved.

- b. Under the Existing and Total Traffic Section, Table 2 is mislabeled as Table 3. There is also a typo in the text reference to Table 2.

Response: This has been corrected in the updated trip generation letter.

- c. Walton Creek Road is referred to as Walnut Creek Road in several Locations.

Response: This has been corrected in the updated trip generation letter.

4. Drainage Study

- a. Under the proposed site conditions section, remove the statement “*Village Drive will also provide the parking required for the residential*”.

Response: Landmark revised the statement to read that “*Village Drive will also provide access to the parking for the residential development*”.

- b. Include Project Sheet-Base Design Standard and Design Checklist for WQCV.

Response: The Base Design Standard and WQCV Checklist are included in Appendix F of the report.

Draft Conditions of Approval:

- 1. The developer shall pay his proportionate share of potential future roadway and/or intersection improvements at TBD, calculated at x% of \$X or \$TBD. Payment shall be submitted prior to issuance of building permit.

Response: Please clarify which improvements this condition relates to.

- 2. Civil construction plans prepared by a licensed Colorado civil engineer are required to be submitted to DRT for review and approval prior to approval of any Improvements Agreement, building permit or grading permit and prior to the start of any construction.

Response: Noted.

- 3. The following items are considered critical improvements and must be constructed and approved prior issuance of a temporary certificate of occupancy or certificate of occupancy:

- Drainage infrastructure and water quality facility
- Paved driveway and parking areas

Response: Noted.

- 4. Prior to certificate of occupancy or certificate of approval, a recorded drainage easement is required for the water quality treatment facility including embankment extents and maintenance access from the public street.

Response: Noted.

- 5. The Ownership & Maintenance Plan for the water quality treatment facility shall be recorded prior to certificate of occupancy.

Response: Noted.

MMW Comments:

1. Revise drawings showing material and size of existing sanitary sewer main; based on our GIS files the existing sewer main is 10" VCP.
[Response: Landmark revised the pipe type.](#)
2. Revise drawings showing proposed sanitary sewer connections to to existing 10" VCP sewer main assuming the VCP pipe will not take a direct tap. Consider replacing 1" VCP with 10" PVC and using Max Adapters.
[Response: Landmark revise the layout of the sewer services and connections to the main.](#)
3. This 10" VCP main in the street needs replacing. The sewer service taps to this project must come in high on the main and drop to elevation as the new main will be lowered by approximately 1-foot. Call Mount Werner Water to discuss options.
[Response: Landmark revise the layout of the sewer services and connections to the main.](#)
4. Revise and resubmit Civils as needed to correct manhole data for manhole 26.7 and 26.6.
[Response: Landmark revised the invert elevation for Manhole 26.6.](#)
5. Revise and resubmit water service plan to eliminate street cuts. Discuss options with MWW.
[Response: Landmark reviewed the potential of private main to service the townhome units from the interior of the site and the proposed individual services from Village Drive appears to be the best configuration based on the snowmelt and construction costs.](#)
6. Based on resubmittal expect comments to follow.
[Response: Noted.](#)