

tres birds

Date: 01.23.2026

Project: Red Mountain Ranch (RMR) – Parcel 1

Submittal: Major Development Permit (MDP) & Preliminary Plan Review (PPR) – R3 Submittal

Attention: Kyle Brotherton

R2 Comment Responses: Town of Eagle Planning Department

Kyle Brotherton,

Thank you for providing comments on the R2 MDP/PPR submittals for the Red Mountain Ranch (RMR) – Parcel 1. The following document contains the design team's responses to the comments dated **11.26.2025**. Those comments have been attached below for reference.

Your comments and our responses are written below in the following format:

Original comment; Rewritten in grey font.

Response: written in black italics. Updated drawings will be noted here as applicable.

Please feel free to reach out to me directly with any questions or concerns regarding our comment responses.

Thank You,



David Hoffman
Architect
561.386.5528
dh@tresbirds.com

Responses to Comments from Town of Eagle Planning Department:

Site Plans – Preliminary Plan and Development Plan:

1. Sheet AS-02: Building 10, Unit 01 details that the front setback is a minimum of 2'6" whereas the measurement is 1'11"

Response: *The AS sheets have been revised to reflect actual dimensions rather than minimums. Buildings have been shifted slightly where required. The dimension identified here is now 3'-0". RE: "R3 – 20260123 SiteUpdates.pdf" for updates.*

2. Sheet AS-03:

- a. Building 12, Unit 02 details that the front setback is a minimum of 2'6" whereas the measurement is 2'3".

Response: *See response to comment 1 above. The dimension identified here is now 3'-0"*

- b. Building 13, Unit 02 details that the front setback is a minimum of 2'6" whereas the measurement is 0'8".

Response: *See response to comment 1 above. The dimension identified here is now 3'-0"*

- c. Building 14, Unit 02 details that the front setback is a minimum of 2'6" whereas the measurement is 2'1".

Response: *See response to comment 1 above. The dimension identified here is now 3'-0"*

- d. Building 24 details that the front setback is a minimum of 2'6" whereas the measurement is 2'2".

Response: *See response to comment 1 above. The dimension identified here is now 3'-0"*

- e. Building 22: The patio is shown within the 75' stream setback; however, the architectural elevations show Unit Type SF-D as having a balcony instead of a patio. Buildings 23, 24, and 25 also show the patio whereas the Unit Type SF-D has a balcony. Please update or detail as necessary.

Response: *The SF units have patios as well as balconies. Both SF-B and SF-D type units are two-level, single-family homes with a main level coming off the grade of the one-way road and a partial lower garden level facing the river. They were designed this way to better react to the site's topography as well as reducing the visible mass of these structures from the rest of the site.*

To better convey this in an overall site plan, we've drawn break lines across the middle of these units. North of the break shows the main level; South of the break shows the garden level. We've revised the graphics of these drawings to make that distinction more apparent. The patio noted at BLDG 22 has been updated to respect the stream setback. RE: "R3 – 20260123 SiteUpdates.pdf" for updates.

tres birds

Landscape Plans:

1. The landscape plans show the raptors nest on site but do not show the bald eagle's nest. Please include the bald eagle's nest.

Response: *Acknowledged. The project team has no objection to this comment. The landscape plans can be revised according to the comment following additional feedback from public hearings.*

Pedestrian Circulation:

1. It is unclear how the pedestrian connection will be made from the property to the existing trail to the north/northwest of the property. Section 4.10.030.A.1.d. requires pedestrian and bicycle connectivity. Please provide additional detail on how this connection will be made, including any permits from other entities such as CDOT, UPRR, or others as necessary.

Response: *This item is addressed in detail on the responses to Pubic Works comments. For response, please refer to the "R2 CommentResponse - ToE PW.pdf" file as well as the "R3 – 20260123 CulvertAccess.pdf" file.*

Civil Plans:

1. Streets are noted as private rights-of-way on the civil plans but Note B on the preliminary plat states that easements, including access easements, are to be dedicated to the Town. Please detail on if the streets will remain private streets maintained by the future HOA.

Response: *Acknowledged. The project team has no objection to this comment. The civil plans can be revised according to the comment following additional feedback from public hearings.*

This concludes the comment responses.