

Applicant Response to:
TOWN OF EAGLE
REFERRAL RESPONSE SUMMARY REPORT
Response Date: August 30, 2018

ISSUED: June 8, 2018

Project Name: Reserve at Hockett Gulch PUD
Owner/Applicant: Dan Metzger, Brue Baukol Capital Partners, LLC
Applicant: Dominic Mauriello, Mauriello Planning Group
Prepared by: Carrie McCool, Planning Consultant for the Town of Eagle

The Eagle Community Development Department is issuing the following Referral Response Summary Report as the referral period has expired. Both internal (Town Staff) and external referral responses received to date can be found in the "Referral Comments" section of this report. The "Next steps" section describes the approaching steps in the development review and approval process. If you have any questions or concerns regarding any comment, contact me or the individual agency contact to clarify the statement and reach an understanding. It is in the applicant's best interest to contact each internal and external referral agency directly in order to streamline the development review process.

REFERRAL COMMENTS SECTION

Community Development

Carrie McCool, Town Planning Consultant

carrie@mccooldevelopment.com

The following comments are limited to high-level discussions related to the standards and requirement of PUDs per §4.11.030 as Staff anticipates the resolve of these comments could result in significant changes to the PUD, sketch subdivision, and ultimate contents of the annexation and development agreements accordingly.

PUD Zoning and Density

1. The intent of HD/PUD 1 and 3 is to promote the development of a small commercial shopping area and/or residential neighborhood or any combination of both. However, there seems to be an overall lack on integration of land uses or demonstration of how the mixture of uses would function as a cohesive development (i.e., vertical or horizontal mixed-use development). Design standards need to be included in the PUD documents to address the integration of uses, scale, density, and dimensional standards (minimum lot area, minimum lot area per dwelling unit, maximum lot coverage, maximum floor area, minimum usable open space per dwelling unit, etc.). Additionally, the future design standards should define the relationship of buildings to the street, paths, and other amenities. This must be adequately addressed considering the PUD is proposed to serve as the zone district regulations for the PUD and would supersede all land use regulations found in the Town's Land Use and Development Code and other areas of the Municipal Code.

- Applicant: These issues have been addressed in the PUD Guide. Development standards, including maximum densities, minimum densities, setbacks, building heights, statements related to integration of uses, minimum lot

size requirements, building setbacks, street standards, parking standards, open space requirements, and reliance on Town design standards and guidelines have been provided.

2. Since multi-family, two-family, and single-family dwellings are proposed for all three planning areas, consider setting forth maximum densities for each with provisions for a 10% density transfer within/between the planning areas to allow for flexibility in addressing market conditions.
 - Applicant: The PUD guide has been revised to allow for maximum FAR and maximum and minimum density. The transfer of density is being allowed between HD/PUD – 1 and 2.
3. Please provide justification/rationale for the commercial uses proposed in HD/PUD 1. Staff is concerned with the allowance of commercial uses in this planning area considering the parcel size and access as commercial uses seems more appropriate off Highway 6 as opposed to Sylvan Lake Road.
 - Applicant: The area is located in the primary entrance to Eagle Ranch allowing for easy access for residents to commercial uses such as grocery and restaurants. It is located directly across the street from a large medical complex and just down the street from the Eagle Ranch commercial center. We believe this location for commercial is ideal to serve the local community, especially that of Eagle Ranch. While we agree that the Grand Ave. frontage is also appropriate, eliminating the Sylvan Lake frontage would reduce the convenience for the Eagle Ranch resident which is a target market. Both locations have their advantages and disadvantages, but both frontages work for a commercial development and both are adequately served by the adjacent roadways. Commercial uses have been changed to a special use in HD/PUD-1 (to match code for HD/PUD and) to allow for additional analysis related to impacts at the time that may occur. Further, we have agreed to limit commercial floor area to 15,000 sq. ft. on HD/PUD-1 to lessen the impacts.
4. The floor area ratio for a commercial PUD per Code is 1.7:1; however, the PUD states the maximum floor area shall not exceed 30,000 feet within planning areas HD/PUD 1 and HD/PUD 3 combined. As noted above, these planning areas will function differently considering access and size. Please provide density and dimensional standards for the commercial uses proposed within each planning area. FAR should be presented in the same fashion within the PUD (1.7:1) versus setting forth maximum square footages.
 - Applicant: The PUD guide has been revised to include an FAR but also a statement about the 30,000 sq. ft. max. There are dimensional limitations for commercial uses also provided. The proposed maximum commercial FAR has been revised in HD/PUD-1 to reflect a reduction to 15,000 sq. ft. of commercial use. That FAR is now proposed at 0.11:1. An FAR of 0.1:1 is provided in HD/PUD-3 to reflect a 30,000 sq. ft. maximum. Both FAR standards are far below that contemplated in the commercial PUD standards found in the code.
5. The intent of HD/PUD 2 is to provide residential housing opportunities that include multi-family, two-family, and/or single-family dwellings. Similar to comment 1 above, staff is concerned about the lack of integration of land uses. Additionally, there is a concern that there are limited design standards to address the different characteristics of the differing residential land uses and densities. For example, the entire planning area could develop as a single-family residential development on any size lot – there are no minimum lot area requirements delineated. Per §405.010.A.3 a, multiple-family dwellings are allowed at a maximum density of one dwelling unit per 2,000 square feet of lot area provided that in addition to all other applicable standards and requirements, the lot area shall include a minimum of 300 square feet of useable open space as defined in this Title, per dwelling unit. If multifamily, two-family and single-family dwelling are allowed by right, there needs to be design and dimensional standards (minimum lot area requirements, lot frontage, percentage of usable open space per dwelling unit, etc.) set forth for each use accordingly.

- Applicant: The PUD has been revised to include a minimum lot size requirement depending on the use and a minimum and maximum density provision. Minimum open space standards have also been put in place.

6. When relief from minimum Code requirements are requested (i.e., parking, park and school land dedication, water rights, tap fees, lighting, building heights, etc.), provide justification/evidence that the requested variation will produce a public benefit over strict application of the regulation varied from, and that such variation is not detrimental to the public good and does not impair the intent and purpose of Chapter 4.11 (see §4.11.010).

Applicant: The applicant has provided a separate letter providing a summary and justification for variations from code standards.

7. Please limit the list of Uses By Right in each planning area to uses only and delete references to function (i.e., irrigation, ditches, and landscaping, utility service structures, temporary construction staging areas, etc.).

- Applicant: This has been addressed in the revised PUD Guide.

8. Staff is concerned with the proposed definition of building height measurement in that the distance measured vertically from any point on the proposed or existing roof or eaves to the existing or finished grade. Depending on the building architecture and grading, the roof or eaves to existing or finished grade could amount to very different building heights. Graphics are often the best tool to convey the intent of regulations. As such, staff requests a graphic that illustrates the building height measurement is provided in the next submittal.

- Applicant: The building height measurement has been revised to more closely align with the Town's definition and a graphic has been provided.

9. Provide a Planning Area Summary Chart that delineates the following per Planning Area:

- Uses
- Gross Acreage
- Percentage of total site
- Maximum FAR
- Maximum DU per acre
- Maximum DUs
- Common open space
- Private open space
- Percentage active recreation open space

- Applicant: The PUD Guide now provides a summary.

Community Design

Please include design standards (architecture, landscaping, signage, exterior lighting, etc.) in the PUD Guide.

- Applicant: Design Guidelines are included in the PUD Guide.

Open Space

1. The intent of open space should be to provide for a unified network of common and private facilities to serve the needs of the residents of an individual development and/or the community at large. In order for land to be counted towards fulfillment of open space requirements, it must be usable, common open space. Further, it is recommended that a

minimum of twenty percent (20%) of the total gross area of a PUD shall consist of common open space. Please provide justification for the reduction in common open space.

- Applicant: The PUD Guide has been revised to comply with the minimum 20% open space recommendation. This minimum will be met with both public and private common open space.

2. Please delineate slopes of OS-1 and OS-2 as seventy-five percent (75%) of common open space shall have a slope of 10 percent (10%) or less and shall lend itself to utilization for recreational purposes.

- Applicant: Our engineer is confirming any slopes greater than 10%. The required minimum common open space area will comply with the 75% requirement for slopes of 10% or less.

3. At least one-half (1/2) of said common open space shall be developed for active recreation which may include play fields, tennis courts, picnic sites, and similar recreation sites. Please explain how OS-1 and OS-2 could accommodate the active recreation as required by Code.

- Applicant: The applicant agrees that it will comply with the requirement that 1/2 of the common open space be active recreation subject to agreement with the Town of the definition of "active recreation" and how it is calculated. This minimum will be met with both public and private common open space.

4. Provide standards for trails (i.e., trail width, materials, construction, etc.).

- Applicant: Standards for trails has been provided.

5. Update the PUD Guide to include provisions for maintenance of open space per Code requirements.

- Applicant: A section has been provided for maintenance of open space requirements in the PUD Guide. This will be more fully developed in the annexation and development agreement.

6. Please revise the PUD Guide to state that the open space areas OS-1 and OS-2 are zoned for open space. The dedication of an open space easement can be dedicated at time of platting.

- Applicant: The PUD Zoning Plan shows the parcels zoned as open space within the PUD. The PUD Guide has been revised to dedicate OS-1 to the Town.

7. Once the open space comments above are addressed, we will be a better position to discuss the municipal land dedication provisions to be set forth in the PUD Guide.

- Applicant: The applicant is proposing a variation from the park land dedication and is included in a separate letter.

PUD Perimeter

1. Please provide perimeter landscape standards within the PUD Guide. Additionally, provide a discussion on how the resulting standards will achieve the goals of the Western Gateway Special Character Area identified in the Eagle Area Community Plan.

- Applicant: We believe the proposed landscape language allows for robust landscaping focused on areas where there is a neighbor with development or a roadway. The vagueness of the Western Gateway Special Character

Area really doesn't provide much direction, but PUD Guide references the Town's planning documents as relevant when reviewing the Development Permit.

2. As discussed in the June 1, 2018 meeting, the Town would like to see landscape standards that require native plantings and are efficient landscaping with specific limitations on installation of sod.
 - Applicant: The applicant has provided landscape standards that reflect water saving measures. A native plant list has been provided in the PUD Guide. This list was also reviewed by Craig Wescoatt with Colorado Parks and Wildlife in order to assure the landscape materials reflected best practices for dealing with wildlife impacts

Street Standards

Please provide street standards within the PUD Guide.

- Applicant: Street and driveway standards have been provided in the PUD Guide.

Phasing

Please include a phasing schedule within the PUD Guide showing when each stage of the project will be started and completed, on and off-site improvements constructed, and the required open space and recreational areas are installed. The planning area boundaries should match the phasing plan. As a reminder, a proportional amount of the required open space and recreation areas shall be included in each phase, such that the project as it is built, will comply with the overall density and open space requirements of the Code at the completion of each phase of development. Phasing shall be accomplished such that at the completion of any phase the development is consistent with the Town's goals and policies.

- Applicant: A conceptual phasing plan has been provided. Provisions on the amount of open space to be provided within each phase has also been addressed in the PUD Guide.

Parking and Loading

Several use classifications or specific uses listed in the PUD Guide have widely varying parking and loading demand characteristics. Please submit a Parking and Loading Study that includes estimates of parking demand based on recommendations of the Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE), or other acceptable estimates as approved by Staff. The Study should include other reliable data collected from uses or combinations of uses that are the same as or comparable with the proposed use. Comparability will be determined by density, scale, bulk, area, type of activity and location. The study must document the source of data used to develop the recommendations.

- Applicant: The applicant is only varying from the Town's parking requirements with regard to multiple-family parking requirements. A parking analysis and justification, based on ITE data, has been provided in the resubmittal and will be addressed in a separate letter summarizing any deviations.

Local Employee Residence Program

Thank you for addressing the Local Employee Housing Residency Requirements in the PUD Guide. We are currently working with the Eagle County Housing and Development Department and Legal Staff to analyze the proposed deviations from the town's local employee housing requirements. Once the review is complete, Staff will provide comments to the Project Team and we can schedule a meeting time to discuss.

- Applicant: We believe the proposed housing plan exceeds the Town's requirements. The Town's requirements do not apply to rental housing, but we are proposing that our proposal apply to the total unit count proposed. As proposed 15% of all units would be deed restricted. If all 500 units are developed, that results in 75 deed restricted units. The PUD outlines the type of deed restriction proposed.

The following comments are based on the Reserve at Hockett Gulch PUD Sketch Plans from AEI dated January 2018 and related application materials.

Utility Impact Report -

- The report indicates that an 8-inch water main will be looped throughout the project. The 'Utility Plan' provided by AEI indicates that the water main will be 12-inch.
- Mott MacDonald is currently using a 12-inch loop to model the system.
- If the proposed mix of 1 and 2-bedroom units is revised or the development scheme changes, the hydraulic model may need to be re-analyzed.
- The hydraulic model currently assumes a non-potable irrigation system. The model may need to be re-analyzed if a potable irrigation system is used.
- Public Works recommends that a 12-inch water main loop extend from somewhere between Phase I and Phase III, follow the south side of Hwy 6 and tie into the 8-inch line on the western side of Eagle Landing at Brush Creek.
- Public Works may request that the 12-inch water main connection to Sylvan Lake Road at the development entrance be moved farther to the north.

Drainage Report

- The proposed methodology is acceptable.
- Due to the project's proximity to the Eagle River and being located at the bottom of the watershed, a waiver of requirements for stormwater quantity control may possibly be granted. The existing drainage conveyance system will need to be analyzed for adequate capacity for 10-yr storm runoff from the project site to the outfall at Brush Creek. If the existing system is inadequate to carry additional storm runoff from the proposed development, onsite quantity control will be required per section 4.13.040 of the Land Use and Development Code.
- Detailed stormwater calculations will need to be provided at development permit review.
- Debris flow/flooding should be further evaluated.

Transportation Impact Study

- It is recommended that a 3rd party transportation engineer/consultant review the 'Transportation Impact Study'.
 - Applicant: All of the engineering comments have been addressed to the degree possible at this point in the process. A debris flow study has been provided and the traffic report has been revised based upon the 3rd party review. Water modelling has occurred.

Open Space

John Staight

john.staight@townofeagle.org

-
1. I appreciate that the applicant has shown a future trail along the southern boundary of the property. This trail could provide a critical access point to Hockett Gulch, if access across Corkey Fitzsimmon's property to the south were to be secured. Hockett Gulch would be the easiest way for hikers, mountain bikers, and motorcycle riders to access the BLM Hardscrabble Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA) trail system. This access has been desired by the recreation community in Eagle for more than 20 years. Both the Rocky Mountain Sport Riders (motorized) and Hardscrabble Trails Coalition (mountain bike) user clubs have expressed their interest in this access. I would expect them to be vocal during the hearing process.

- Applicant: Duly noted.

2. I believe in previous versions of this project a public trailhead was shown at the outlet of Hockett Gulch, on the property. I'm not sure why no trailhead is shown in this version. I believe a trailhead was previously agreed to. I feel the best location for a trailhead would actually be on the southeastern most end of the site, adjacent to Sylvan Lake Road. Trailhead users could access the parking area either off Sylvan Lake Road, or the eastern most interior road. The trailhead could be built on the applicant's property and/or the strip of Town open space just east of the site. I would recommend negotiating to have the applicant pay for a trailhead now, even if it were to be built in the future. The Town's open space fund could not afford to pay for a paved trailhead parking area. I'd be happy to work with Town engineering staff to come up with a cost estimate.

- Applicant: The applicant is not proposing a trailhead parking area. We believe it is sufficient to provide a trail easement to allow future access by the community a future trail connection on the adjoining property. We have no opposition if the Town wants to construct a trailhead parking area on its open space parcel. We've been told by the sport riders and mountain bike community that access from home is sufficient to address the desire to access this trail at this location and we agree.

3. I doubt the plan submitted meets the Town's parkland dedication requirements. If in lieu fees were collected, I suggest that they be used to purchase access through the Fitzsimmons property.

- Applicant: Due to the extent of useable open space proposed within each development area, outside of the Open Space Parcels, we believe we have exceeded the need for a land dedication or fees. Adding fees to a project focused on local housing only acts to raise the cost of housing.

4. With the very high density being proposed, I think there could be a lot of potential for trespassing on the Fitzsimmons property. Hockett Gulch will be a big attractant. For this reason, the applicant needs to do some type of property perimeter treatment (fencing, landscaping) to mitigate the trespassing potential.

- Applicant: The applicant does not believe that 16.86 units per acre is "very high density." The applicant disagrees that fencing should be required along the entire perimeter of the property.

5. During the annexation negotiations, the Town should see if the applicant would be willing to contribute funds towards the purchase the adjacent Fitzsimmons property. The County seems willing to possibly contribute funds toward the purchase. Access through Hockett Gulch would be a big selling point to future renters or owners on site and would therefore benefit the applicant when marketing the property.

- Applicant: The applicant is not interested in contributing to the purchase of the neighbor's property. Furthermore, the purpose of the PUD is to provide much needed housing to employees in both the Town of Eagle and Eagle County and the burden of exactions decrease the goal of providing housing.

6. On page 6 of the application, 9. Trail Use in OS-1: I do not think hunting access should be prohibited. Parks and Wildlife would like to see hunting access through Hockett Gulch. The hunting traffic would be minimal.

- Applicant: We agreement and have removed the restriction.

7. On page 7, regarding motorized use: I believed an agreement between the Town and the applicant regarding motorized use should be formalized now, not latter. I believe specific noise level contours, which are acceptable to both parties, should be specified (the wording in the application is too vague). The seasonal closure of September to May is not consistent with either the Town's winter closures or the BLM's. The Town's is December 15 – April 15, and the BLM's is

December 1 – April 15. The closure should match the Town's or the BLM's. I agree that the soft path trail should not be built or encouraged until access through the Fitzsimmons property is secured.

- Applicant: The applicant has addressed the closure dates to be consistent with CPW/BLM.

Eagle Police

Joe Stauffer, Chief of Police

jstauffer@townofeagle.org

The residential proposal of 500 dwelling units will have an impact upon TOE services, to include public safety.

The proposal indicates 400 dwelling units will be one and two-bedroom configurations:

- Assuming these units are divided equally (200 one-bedroom and 200 two-bedroom) and assuming each one-bedroom unit is occupied by 2 residents and each two-bedroom is occupied by four residents, this portion of the project would bring an additional 1,200 residents to our community.
- Applicant: Agreed. This calculation represents the highest possible population but not the likely population. Many one-bedroom units will be occupied by one person and many two-bedroom units will be occupied by two people. In this scenario the population would be 600. The population number is probably in the 900 range that is what we have assumed.

The remaining 100 dwellings are proposed as townhomes, apartments and single-family homes:

- Assuming these are two-bedroom and three-bedroom configurations, this will provide for approximately 500 additional residents

The residential proposal appears to provide housing for approximately 1,700 residents. Commercial implications will incur additional impacts, especially if a bar or restaurant is proposed.

- Applicant: Here again, this assumes a maximum case scenario that assumes all 500 units are developed and assumes maximum occupancy which we don't believe is a safe assumption.

Effectively, this development, as currently proposed, will trigger the need for the Town of Eagle to obtain 3.7 additional sworn staff members (police-patrol officers) to meet the reasonable law enforcement per resident rate (nationwide, this rate is 2.4 per 1,000 inhabitants based on 2016 FBI UCR data. However, due to law enforcement's varied service requirements and functions, as well as the distinct demographic traits and characteristics of our community, this ratio was reduced by Chief Stauffer to 2.2 sworn law enforcement per 1,000 residents. As the Town of Eagle continues to grow its commercial and recreational development, the ratio will be assessed again one the population reaches 10,000 residents).

- Applicant: We agree there will be impacts to municipal services which we believe are adequately addressed with the fees and revenues that will be produced by the project including property and sales tax. Please refer to the fiscal analysis that details the revenues that will flow to the Town.

An in-depth traffic study may be warranted to determine sight-distance, round-about access, traffic numbers with residential assumptions only and with residential/commercial (as proposed). Also, traffic/pedestrian access, emergency access and public ROW assessments. It would appear that two roundabouts would be needed to handle the amount of traffic to this development (one on HWY 6 and one on Sylvan Lake Road). Sylvan Lake Road may need to become a 4-lane roadway in

the future from HWY 6 to the roundabout access for this proposed development. I would suggest having one public thoroughfare – no parking on this thoroughfare- and the remaining portions of the project to be private streets and ally access. This will yield benefits for both the Town (maintenance and enforcement) while providing homeowners with a more viable option to manage streets.

- Applicant: A detail traffic study has been provided, reviewed by the Town’s consultant, and revised based on their comments. We do not agree that a no parking thoroughfare should be provided and if provided would make the project infeasible. All of the parking and streets are proposed as private facilities.

What are the environmental impacts to this area?

- Applicant: An environmental report has been provided that addresses the environmental impacts of the project. CPW and CGS have opined on the project. CPW agrees with the findings of our report.

How will parking be managed and how many visitor parking spaces are being required?

- Applicant: If the apartment project is developed, the parking for that portion of the site will be managed and enforced by an onsite management company. Parking will be strictly enforced. Guest parking is assumed within the parking requirement. A multiple family parking analysis has been provided by our traffic consultant and based on ITE data. The parking ratio proposed exceeds the ITE predicted demand which includes guest parking.

It appears they have ample pocket parks and opportunities for residents of their proposed community. What plans do they have to promote a viable community asset (i.e. daycare, community recreation facility, community center, etc.?). How will this be connected to the Town of Eagle and not looked upon as another large private residential area/HOA?

- Applicant: The project will provide significant pocket parks and areas for the residents onsite. We are not proposing a community facility on this property other than providing for a trail connection through the property. The project is well integrated into the community with access to the Town’s extensive trail and pedestrian system and located proximate to the ECO transit stop on Grand Avenue. If the commercial component is developed it would provide services to the entire community envisioned as a small grocer, restaurant, daycare, or other local commercial space. We do not believe there is a need for another community park or facility in this area.

I agree with the high-level assessment and need of additional housing in our area. I would suggest that the Town look into an agreement with the developer to provide two units at cost to the Town in order for the TOE to own and maintain employee housing.

- Applicant: The applicant is happy to work with the Town to provide local governmental agencies and service providers with priority on any wait list that may be generated for the rental product, if and when developed. A provision requiring this has been added to the PUD Guide. We want to include local teachers, police officers, fire fighters, paramedics, and other governmental employee in this project and in the community. We also want to support the local business community in providing housing for all of the Eagle businesses that exist. We know the demand is exceptionally high.

The proposed architectural design, with ample use of rock, wood and lighting demonstrates a desire to remain “mountain friendly.” However, I would suggest lowering or amending the roof line for the small square additions to the main apartment building, as they look awkward from the side.

- Applicant: We believe the proposed apartment unit designs fit will in the community and will leave that review until Development Permit and with the experts on the P&Z.

The developer should work with the TOE to provide CPTED strategies.

- Applicant: We are happy to discuss design that addresses crime prevention to the extent that it results in a livable and marketable project.

The developer should commit to crime-free leasing.

- Applicant: We are not sure what that means. The rental company will do background checks on all occupants to ensure the population is as crime free as possible.

Western Eagle County Metropolitan Recreation District

Janet Bartnik

jbartnik@wecmr.org

Hwy 6 access – If I am reading this right, they want to leave access to Hwy 6 open in both directions, even though the transportation report indicates that at some future date residents may prefer to turn right and loop the roundabout to then head towards Gypsum. Some times of day I bet that access to west and w=east bound Hwy6 is fine, but I wonder if/when it might be better to go ahead and put the restriction in sooner rather than later when residents are used to having the opportunity to go either way. Exiting the development to Sylvan Lake Road is always an opportunity to make the drive simpler.

- Applicant: A traffic study has been provided by an expert. This report has been updated based on comments from the Town's traffic consultant. The report shows that the traffic generated can be accommodated.

Their open space is heavily exaggerated, as it seems to me that OS-1 and OS-2 parcels are extremely small and, particularly for OS-1, unusable for any type of recreation. I certainly hope those are private dedications and not publicly dedicated spaces. The trail access is a GREAT idea and needs to stay in. It should be brought all the way to the property line. But, truly, a soft surface trail is not an exceptional effort on their part to consider in exchange for the lack of open space. Hopefully we can get the adjacent homeowner to allow for an easement to make the connection to the incredible trail system that is so close residents will be able to smell it!

There is NO park space. An HOA operated pool and clubhouse NEVER meet needs for children. I did not see this as an over 50 community, so there will be a need for some type of playground. I'd suggest dumping the fitness space, which will likely be underutilized to use their words, for a nice commercial playground by the clubhouse. Parents can drive to Endorphin or other gyms. Kids can't drive (or walk alone) to the great Town Park playground on 6th Street or the Brush Creek pavilion playground. (Which are definitely NOT underutilized as they have purported. Can you tell those comments offended me? Maybe they counted kids on the playgrounds during the school day...)

- Applicant: No offense was intended. We agree with your conclusions and will provide playgrounds and other facilities focused on children. We have modified the PUD to ensure extensive useable open space within each planning area outside of the open space parcels. We have removed the affronting statements from our submittal and meet our needs onsite. The project will exceed the minimum Town's open space by containing 31% of the land as open space, with 60% of that as active open space areas and there will be significant recreational areas for children provided onsite.

I assume they will propose to pay the fee-in-lieu of land dedication, as there is no way they'll have space to dedicate public parkland. They should pay the full fee – no credit for private open space or their proposed improvements.

- Applicant: The applicant is proposing to vary from the parkland dedication requirements. This is detailed in a separate letter to the Town. A significant amount of active recreation areas and open space areas is being provided onsite for the residents. Additional exactions only act to raise the cost of development and reduce the ability to provide housing for the local community. There has to be a balance and we believe this PUD strikes that balance, as revised.

Holy Cross Energy

Keith Hernandez

No objections from Holy Cross Energy.

Colorado Parks and Wildlife

Perry Will

Craig Wescoatt, Wildlife Manager

craig.wescoatt@state.co.us

The Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife (CPW) appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the Reserve a Hockett Gulch proposal. Examination of the Baseline Environmental Conditions report, specifically the Wildlife section, provided and accurate description of wildlife conditions on the property. The report also provided anticipated wildlife impacts and these too were accurate. CPW concurs that the development of a Wildlife Mitigation and Enhancement plan would be beneficial to help offset impacts to wildlife populations and that the Eagle Ranch PUD would serve as a good guide for this plan.

Because of the proximity, adjacent to Eagle Ranch, similar recommendations to those of Eagle Ranch will be made for this proposal. The Environmental Conditions report stated that the greatest threats are likely to occur from the increased potential for human wildlife interaction. While that is true, most of those issues can be addressed with BMP's on trash, storage of compost, hummingbird feeders and barbecues. The guidelines provided in Eagle Ranch's PUD concerning these potential conflicts are recommended to be adopted. The same is true for fencing. Fencing does not need to be excluded but the extent and placement of fencing should not preclude wildlife movement through and around the development. The area does have a high potential for both mountain lion and black bear interactions. Informational packets concerning Living with these two species should be provided and residents should be made aware that the development is located within a high lion and bear use area.

The largest potential impact to wildlife will be from dispersed use onto adjacent public lands. Eagle Ranch once again addressed this issue by incorporating seasonal closures on trails to protect wintering wildlife. CPW would recommend that similar measures are incorporated at Hockett Gulch.

Landscaping can be an attractant to wildlife. Planting less desirable plant species, deer resistant varieties or native species can reduce potential conflict. CPW is indemnified from damage to landscaped property.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.

- Applicant: The revised PUD Guide has been revised to address CPW's comments.

Fire District

Randy Cohen

rcohen@gefpd.org

Road sizes accessing home sites must be in accordance with IFC 2015, including apparatus turn arounds (2015 IFC, appendix D).

Road sizes must also allow access for our aerial apparatus to extend to the roof line of each building. (I can get engineers the specifications of the truck).

Water supply must be adequate for fire flows found in the 2015 IFC , Appendix B, Table B105.1(2). If the buildings are equipped with an automatic sprinkler system, fire flows will be reduced by 25%.

- Applicant: We met with Randy Cohen based on these comments. The development standards proposed in the PUD Guide address his comments.

Eagle River Watershed Council

Holly Loff, Executive Director

Bill Hoblitzell, Water Resources Program Advisory Staff

loff@erwc.org

bill@lotichydrological.com

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the Reserve at Hockett Gulch proposed annexation and PUD project. Eagle River Watershed Council (ERWC) advocates for the health and conservation of the Upper Colorado and Eagle River basins through research, education and projects; and strives to protect and enhance the high-quality natural, scenic & economic values that our rivers provide to the citizens, visitors and wildlife of our watershed. Vigorously protecting our aquatic systems ensures they will continue to provide their numerous social, economic, and ecosystem benefits in perpetuity.

We have reviewed the available materials to better understand potential impacts to stream ecosystems, wetlands, and aquatic-dependent wildlife. Due to this project's relatively small direct impact to water resources, we have few comments. The geographic location of the project largely separates it from direct impacts to surface waters, riparian zones, or floodplains. No wetlands were identified by the proponent's environmental review. Hockett Gulch, which bisects the property, is an arid ephemeral wash that flows in response to storm events and otherwise does not support wetland plant communities that might evidence near-surface groundwaters in the project area.

The primary impacts of the Reserve at Hockett Gulch to Brush Creek and the Eagle River will occur via the continued incremental development of the valley floor and associated increase in impervious surfaces. Surface runoff from impervious surfaces in urbanized areas alters the hydrologic regime of receiving streams by reducing groundwater infiltration and increasing the 'flashiness' of hydrography. Pollutants from landscaping treatments and impervious surfaces include nutrients, pesticides/herbicides, sediment, and metals, which can be quickly flushed to streams via directly-connected stormwater infrastructure. Currently, the Town of Vail is investing significant community resources in attempting to stop and reverse such impacts to Gore Creek.

We hope that Town of Eagle will include strong requirements for Low-Impact Development (LID)¹ techniques to manage direct site stormwater runoff and promote groundwater infiltration rather than increasing Directly Connected Impervious Areas to Brush Creek and the Eagle River. The inclusion of such practices in the Reserve at Hockett and other new developments in the area will help avoid the mistakes of previous development in the valley and better-ensure the health of our waterways in the future.

Finally, in recognition of a changing climate and growing population, ERWC encourages critical evaluation of water supplies with each and every proposed development. This careful review is necessary to ensure water supplies are available far into the future to safeguard future water demands and uses, including the environment, recreation, the economy, and drinking water.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input. Should you have any questions regarding our comments or concerns, please contact ERWC directly at your convenience.

- Applicant: The proposed PUD Guide addresses all of these comments.

Colorado Geological Survey

Jill Carlson, C.E.G Engineering Geologist

carlson@mines.edu

Colorado Geological Survey has reviewed the Reserve at Hockett Gulch sketch plan referral. I understand the applicant proposes a mix of housing, commercial development and open space on 29.65 acres located west of Sylvan Lake Road and south of Highway 6. The available referral documents include a Reserve at Hockett Gulch Annexation, PUD & Sketch Subdivision Applications written submittal (Mauriello Planning Group, January 31, 2018), a Baseline Environmental Conditions Report (Watershed Environmental Consultants, December 11, 2015), a set of 17 sketch/site/civil plans (Alpine Engineering, January 31, 2018), and a Preliminary Geotechnical Study, JHY Parcel (HP Geotech, September 30, 2015).

CGS agrees with HP Geotech's assessment (page 3) of geologic hazards and development constraints: "Potential geologic hazards that could impact the site include debris flow and flooding from Hockett Gulch, hydro-compressive alluvial fan and colluvial deposit soils, and the potential for sinkhole development from possible voids in the underlying evaporite bedrock." HP satisfactorily addresses the potential evaporite subsidence hazard and makes valid preliminary recommendations for reducing damage related to compressible, hydro-compressive and expansive soil.

However, HP does not address the debris flow hazard, stating only that "The potential for flooding should be further evaluated by the civil engineer and may require additional study by us." Due to high sediment content, ability to entrain and transport gravel-, cobble-, and boulder-size rocks and debris, and unpredictable flow characteristics, debris flows pose hazards that are very different from sheetflow or channelized water flow hazards, often require field work to estimate the frequency, thickness, lateral extent, and other characteristics of past debris flows, and are typically addressed outside of a standard drainage report.

Debris flow/debris flood hazard. The site is located on a mapped debris fan at the mouth of Hockett Gulch. HP Geotech (page 2) describes the Hockett Gulch drainage basin as "relatively large." CGS calculates that the drainage basin is approximately 1300 acres. Watershed Environmental states on page 12 of their Baseline Environmental Conditions Report, "A swale or berm is indicated on the preliminary site plan prepared by Alpine Engineering (Appendix A) to mitigate small debris flows, which may require further study and design by the geotechnical engineer."

Sheet C1.02, Site Plan, of the PUD Sketch Plan set, shows a "Debris Swale" along the base of the slope above proposed Phase III, but the swale overlaps with a parking area. It appears that Hockett Gulch is proposed to enter a small drainage channel near where the gulch enters the property, but it is not clear whether the channel or its culverts have been sized and sloped correctly to effectively transport bulked flows and debris. It is also not clear whether a debris flow or flood out of Hockett Gulch would remain confined to the existing channel and be captured by the proposed channel.

- **CGS strongly recommends that the town require a site-specific debris flow/debris flood hazard analysis and, if necessary, a mitigation and maintenance plan.**
- The debris flow hazard evaluation should include anticipated probability of occurrence and volume, and estimates of flow type, flow depth, deposition area, runout, gradation of debris, flow impact forces, and streamflow inundation and sediment burial depths. Debris flow hazard analysis conclusions should include delineation of hazard area(s), and a discussion of the likely effects of debris flows on the proposed development.
- If hazard mitigation is determined to be necessary, the mitigation plan should include specific recommendations for design, location, sizing, construction, and maintenance of detention or diversion structures, channels and culverts to accommodate anticipated, bulked flows.

- Debris flow hazard increases as a result of events that reduce hillside vegetation, such as avalanche, disease, wildfire, grading and other disturbances; debris flow mitigation structures should include a factor of safety to account for uncertainty and increased debris volumes as a result of wildfire.
- Any debris flow mitigation (catchment, deflection, conveyance) structure(s) will require ongoing inspection and maintenance to maintain effectiveness, and must be designed, constructed and maintained so that hazards to other properties and roads are not exacerbated.
- Applicant: The debris flow analysis has been completed and provided to CGS. The PUD as proposed can accommodate any mitigation that may be necessary within the channel for Hockett Gulch drainage being proposed. The PUD Guide has been updated requiring further analysis when a development plan is reviewed by the Town.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. If you have questions or require further review, please call me at (303) 384-2643, or via e-mail.

Next Steps

The Town is committed to assisting applicants through the development review process. We are looking forward to collaborating with the Project Team on how to best address the comments to ensure the purpose of Chapter 4.11 is captured in the PUD documents thereby facilitating an efficient public hearing process and ultimate build out of a vibrant mixed-use development. As such, Town Staff will make themselves available for weekly conference calls to collaborate on how to best address comments or issues as they arise. Since the Development Review Team meets on Tuesdays, Staff suggests we schedule weekly conference calls on Mondays instead of Wednesdays as we discussed at the June 1st meeting. Please contact Carrie McCool, Town Planning Consultant to schedule regular conference call times that work best for everyone's schedule. We propose to have discussions on non-potable utilities and water rights on the agenda for the first conference call.

For formal resubmittals, the Project Team shall address all of the Town Staff, and external referral agency comments then resubmit the following:

1. A point-by-point letter which states how all of the comments (including external referral comments) have been addressed; and
2. Revised PUD and other documents along with digital files.

If you have any questions concerning comments on your project or the development review process, please feel free to contact Carrie McCool at 303.378.4540 or via email at carrie@mccooldevelopment.com.