



January 20, 2026

Tez Hawkins
Town of Eagle
200 Broadway
Eagle, CO 81631

**RE: HAYMEADOW RMF-4/5 MAJOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AND
SUBDIVISION; DR25-08 & FP25-01**

Dear Tez Hawkins:

Thank you for your first review of the Haymeadow RMF-4/5 Major Development Permit and Subdivision. We have addressed the comments that were received on December 1, 2025, on the following pages.

Please feel free to contact me directly at mtestin@norris-design.com should you have any comments, questions and/or requests for additional information. We look forward to continuing to work with the Town to make the Haymeadow project a success.

Sincerely,
Norris Design

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Megan Testin".

Megan Testin
Principal



STAFF PLANNER COMMENTS SECTION

General:

1. This Major Development Plan, application number DR25-08, Major Development Plan and Subdivision applications number FP25-01, were reviewed under the fifth amended Haymeadow PUD Guide dated August 27, 2025, the TOE of Eagle Land Use Development Code (LUDC) as amended and proposed November 2025, and the Town Ordinance 13 Series 2021 related to additional Housing obligations for the Haymeadow PUD.

Response: Thank you for your review of our development project. Please find our responses to the comment response letter provided below.

2. Complete the upper portion of the application form.

Response: The box noting the type of Development Application has been checked for "Major Development Permit". Schedule A has also been attached as part of the Application Form.

3. The "Cottage Neighborhood Plan" and "Architectural Set" that were submitted are the same documents. The document titled "Cottage Neighborhood Plan" will be removed from the application materials. Confirm with the staff planner that this is the correct direction.

Response: That is fine, thank you.

Project Narrative:

1. Consider revising the color palette for the Cottage Lot Boundary graphic on page 4 of the project narrative. The Cottage Court Parcels and Private ROW/Open Space are similar colors and may not be distinguishable to other reviewers.

Response: The graphic has been revised to provide more color distinction between the cottage court parcels and the private ROW / open space, as requested.

2. Page 5 of the project narrative references "125%" for the maximum density transfer, and was likely intended to read "1.25" or "25%." This change should be made for the accuracy of the application.

Response: This has been corrected to read "25%".

3. How are density transfers being tracked throughout the lifetime of the development? Demonstrate or provide a density transfer and overall unit tracking mechanism/spreadsheet for this development plan and future development. The mechanism tracking sheet should represent the entire Haymeadow development and delineate:

- Total Units allowed.
- Affordable and Resident-occupied unit obligations
- Number Units, Density, and obligations provided under a current development proposal

It's preferred that the density transfer/development tracking spreadsheet be provided in the next submission for this application; however, it's not required. Depending on the preferences of the Town, it may be required under conditions of approval or before a public hearing. Staff Planner Jessica Lake will facilitate and be your Town contact in developing the tracking mechanism.

Response: A density transfer table is included in the resubmittal materials, which accounts for the density transfers associated with the subject application, and can be used as the template document to continue tracking all future density transfers moving forward.

4. In the project narrative, further demonstrate how the Section 4.02.050 Local Employee Residency Resident Program (LERP) is met with this major development plan in combination with the 30 Resident Occupied (RO) units required per Town Ordinance 13 Series 2021 [Attached]. The required number of LERP units provided by the proposed development doesn't appear to align with the requirements of LUDC. Revise the proposed LERP units and demonstrate that the Town Ordinance 13



Series 2021 is met, or provide a response demonstrating a miscalculation by the staff planner. The following calculations were made under this review:

Total number of units	89 units
LERP Requirements (15% Affordable; 35% RO)	13 affordable units; 31 RO units
Town ordinance 13 series 2021	30 additional RO units over the above the LERP requirements

Response: Please see the submitted LERP table. The application proposes 24 LERP Units and 16 RO units, which fulfill the remaining requirements of the Haymeadow LERP Plan for Neighborhood A-1. Referral comments received from Nikki Davis, Town of Eagle Economic Development & Housing Specialist concur that the application complies with the requirements of the Haymeadow LERP Plan.

5. Provide an estimated or desired construction date timing for phase 1 and phase 2. If there isn't an anticipated timeframe, state this in the narrative. This is a common question from the elected and appointed officials.

Response: The developer intends to start construction of Phase 1 in Spring 2026 and complete Phase 2 in Summer/Fall 2027. This timeline has been added to the narrative, in the Phasing section on page 9.

Plat:

1. Refer to the attached markup of the plat for additional comments.

Response: Noted

2. The "General Utility Easement" or "General Use Utility Easement" provides private access. It should also be stated as a private access easement. Provide statements on access maintenance similar to what is stated for Tract A.

Response: The proposed easement labeling and certification language is the standard and customary language that has been used on all previous Haymeadow plats, and we would like to keep this language consistent on all plats throughout the subdivision.

3. Under the Town Council Certificate, revise the mayor's name to Bryan Woods.

Response: This has been updated.

4. Additional comments and revisions are anticipated in a subsequent Town review as the development layout is anticipated to change.

Response: Understood.

Development Plan:

1. Refer to the attached markup of the development plan and Architectural drawings for additional comments.

Response: Noted

2. Provide an estimated or desired construction date timing for phase 1 and phase 2. If there isn't an anticipated timeframe, state this in the narrative. This is a common question from the elected and appointed officials.

Response: The developer intends to start construction of Phase 1 in Spring 2026 and complete Phase 2 in Summer/Fall 2027. This timeline has been added to the narrative, in the Phasing section on page 9.

3. Remove existing property lines and delineate proposed property lines more clearly so setbacks and other applicable dimensional standards can be verified.



Response: Updated.

4. Label the trash enclosures on the development plan.

Response: Updated

5. The development plan uses similar dashed line types and is difficult to differentiate. Revise the line type so setbacks and other dimensional standards can be verified.

Response: Line types are differentiated by different dashes, and a setback exhibit has been included for clarification.

6. Staking for building setbacks should be verified before foundation pour for buildings 103, 104, 106, 108, 109, 128, 129, and 172. The buildings are close proximity (30 inches or less) to the required 15' building setback.

Response: Developer agrees to stake the buildings adjacent to setbacks.

7. Building separation requirements as required in the Haymeadow PUD were individually measured under this review and comply with the Haymeadow PUD guide. In the subsequent review, please provide these measurements on the development plan. Especially if there are revisions to the site layout, this will reduce the time spent in the review and, ultimately, the pass-thru cost.

Response: Understood.

8. Due to the line work on the development plan having similar dashed properties, it's difficult to follow. Revise the line work so setbacks, easements, and buildings can be verified.

Response: Line types are differentiated by different dashes, and a setback exhibit has been included for clarification.

9. Several roof eaves or patios encroach into the required building setback. Revise the development to comply with building setbacks. Roof eaves are allowed to encroach into the building setback by 30 inches per the Haymeadow PUD guide. The PUD doesn't address decks or patios for Neighborhood A1 multi-family development, therefore the regulations default to the LUDC, which states that only uncovered decks less than 30 inches above grade can encroach into the setback 5'-8'. This includes units 103, 106, 108, 109, 104, 128, 129, 122, 125, 133, 144, 147, 148, 166, 167, 169, and 172.

Response: The plans have been revised to ensure all setback encroachments are less than 30 inches.

10. The Housing unit types, Counts, and site layouts between the Architectural Site Plan and Development Plan do not align. Revised for an accurate representation of the project and review of the application's dimensional standards. For example, refer to units 125, 128, or 129; the unit numbers and building footprints are different between the architectural site plan and the development plan.

Response: This has been updated and corrected in the re-submittal material.

11. Designate the lots on the development plan to align with the lot numbers on the plat.

Response: This has been addressed.

12. The Haymeadow PUD states the Neighborhood A1 Core Trail will be approved by the Town as part of the Development Permit review process for the adjacent multi-family buildings, and the trail shall be constructed concurrently with the multi-family units. The trail easement north of the proposed development is existing; however, the paved trail is not clearly labeled as existing on the development, landscape, or civil plans. Propose construction of the trail within this development plan, or provide a response and update to the project narrative that addresses the trail's status.

Response: The Neighborhood A1 Core Trail has been constructed with the infrastructure of Filing 2 of this development, and in accordance with this provision of the Haymeadow PUD. The



A1 Core Trail was designed and built in conformance with the Haymeadow PUD Trails Plan. This clarification has been added to the revised narrative, and callouts have been added to the plans labeling the trail.

13. The development is lacking interior pedestrian connectivity to sidewalks outside this development plan, as well as interior neighborhood connectivity. For multi-building projects, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity shall be provided between the project and existing or planned off-site amenities such as regional trails, bus stops, retail destinations, and open space. [Section 4.10.030.A.1.d]. On multi-building sites, internal sidewalks shall connect parking areas to building entrances, and building entrances to other site amenities like clubhouses, picnic areas, playgrounds, and parks. [Section 4.12.070.F]:
 - a. Also, refer to the Town Public Works comments regarding sidewalk connectivity. A call/worksession may be needed between planning, public works, and the project designers to generate a solution and design for pedestrian/bicyclist connectivity and safe routes.
 - b. Where sidewalks are provided, consider Section 4.12.070C.11, which states, To allow for vehicle maneuvering and prevent vehicles from overhanging the sidewalk, there shall be a minimum clear distance on private property of 20 feet perpendicular to the garage doors or carport openings that are perpendicular to the public right-of-way.
 - c. Where sidewalks are provided, consider Section 4.12.070.A.1.a, which states, Minimum length of a driveway from the front of the garage door to the back of sidewalk shall be a minimum of 30 feet; this shall only apply where a sidewalk is present.

Response: The plans have been revised to add connections from the proposed development to the Spine Trail (A1 Core Trail) and adjacent sidewalks, in accordance with these comments and suggestions, and to provide interior pedestrian/bicycle lanes along the interior roadways. Striping has been added to the roadway section, to have a dedicated pedestrian walkway and still have 20' drive lane. We have also added signage to the internal streets to address.

14. Provide a statement in the project narrative that demonstrates 4.12.070.A.1.d, which states that buildings shall be positioned to maximize opportunities for solar gain and solar energy applications. At least 30 percent of new residential lots shall be solar-oriented, with the longest lot line dimension oriented to within 30 degrees of a true east-west line; for a reduction in this requirement, refer to Section 4.15.020.A.3.

Response: In accordance with Section 4.15.020.A.3. of the Town Development Code, the proposed lots are designed to maximize solar access. The application proposes three (3) single family lots, fourteen (14) duplex lots, and five (5) cottage courtyard lots, which range in size from 1.17 to 1.99 acres. In accordance with this code provision, 57% of the proposed lots are solar-oriented with the longest lot line dimension oriented to within 30 degrees of a true east-west line. See unit matrix on Architectural Site Plan sheet A.0 for the list of units with optimal solar orientation.

15. Storage, recycling, and waste collection, and loading areas shall be located at least 20 feet from any public street, public sidewalk, or building with a residential use. Adjust the trash enclosure location to be a minimum of 20 feet from the residential units. [Section 4.11.060.B.2.b]

Response: Within the multi-family cottage courtyard parcels, the Haymeadow PUD requires a minimum 15 ft. setback from the exterior property lines and a minimum 10 ft. interior building separation requirement within the development site.

Maintaining a 20 ft. setback from the trash enclosures is not functional for the proposed cottage courtyard site design. This requirement would result in large open space areas surrounding each trash enclosure, which would not function well from a site design and land use efficiency perspective, and would require the elimination of units in each cottage courtyard.



For these reasons, we are working with the Town of Eagle on a LUDC amendment that would allow a 10 ft. setback from all trash enclosures, consistent with the interior 10' building separation requirement that applies within the multi-family cottage courtyard parcels. This code amendment is scheduled to precede this application in the public hearing processes.

16. The enclosed trash storage areas are allowed within the setback so long as the enclosure is not covered, and the fences or walls meet the allowed fence height. The proposed trash enclosures need to be relocated out of the building setback or redesigned to be an uncovered structure. [Section 4.11.060.B.3.]

Response: Per the response above, we are working with the Town of Eagle on a LUDC amendment that would allow a 10 ft. setback from all trash enclosures, which will move the trash enclosures outside the required setbacks and enable these enclosures to be covered.

17. To avoid issues at the building permit stage, confirm that there's consultation or correspondence with gas, telecom, and electricity providers for horizontal separation and spacing requirements within the 10-foot easement shown on the plat and development plan. [Section 4.15.040.C.3]

Response: Acknowledged, coordination with Holy Cross electric will be completed prior to building permit stage.

18. Section 4.15.060., Municipal and park land dedication is met through the annexation agreement Resolution 12, Series 2014. This comment is only informational; no response is required.

Response: Comment noted. Thank you.

19. The bicycle parking plan shows the proposed orientation and layout for the single-family and duplex homes. For consistency and clarity, for clarity show these on all the applicable plans with clarifying notes or show them on none of the plans.

Response: The orientation and layout for the single-family and duplex homes have been removed from all plans on this submittal.

20. A letter from the Haymeadow Design Review Board (DRB) was provided that states all construction shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans dated August 1, 2025. A new letter is required with the revision of the plans. This is not required with the next submittal, but is required before a public hearing is scheduled. The DRB's letter only needs to be updated to reflect the date of the set of plans that will be published for a public hearing.

Response: Comment noted. A new letter will be provided with the revision of the plans.

21. Open Space calculations meet the 10% requirement for cottage homes. Open Space will be measured again in a subsequent review by the Town, with the anticipation that the development layout will be revised.

Response: Open Space has been recalculated and continues to meet the 10% requirement for cottage homes.

Architectural Plan:

1. Refer to the attached markup of the Architectural drawings for additional comments.

Response: Please see the revised drawings showing how comments are addressed.

2. The Unit matrix on sheet A0 doesn't align with the breakdown of units on sheet A0.

Response: See revised drawings for unit matrix.



3. The bedroom count on E2, D2, and F2 need to be revised.
Response: See revised drawings with updated bedroom counts.
4. The Housing unit types, Counts, and site layouts between the Architectural Site Plan and Development Plan do not align. Revised for an accurate representation of the project and review of the application's dimensional standards. For example, refer to units 125, 128, or 129; the unit numbers and building footprints are different between the architectural plan and development plan.
Response: See revised drawings with updated site and unit information. Note: some unit types will have varied porch locations and designs.
5. Designate the lots on the architectural plan to align with the lot numbers on the plat.
Response: See revised drawings with updated site and lot numbering information.
6. The minimum depth for first-floor front porches and/or patios shall be 7 feet for single-family and duplex homes.
Response: The minimum 7 ft. depth requirement for first-floor front porches applies only to single-family and duplex homes, not multi-family cottage units located on multi-family development parcels. This clarification was included in a recent minor PUD amendment, to clarify this within the Haymeadow PUD in advance of this multi-family cottage courtyard MDP application.
7. Provide the material colors for the trash enclosure in the architectural plans.
Response: See revised plan set for color and materials information.
8. Per the comments from Colorado Parks and Wildlife and Section 4.12.070.A.2.d of the LUDC, state the security measures used on the doors to prevent access from black bears.
Response: Wildlife-proof latch assemblies shall be installed on the enclosure gates to prevent access from black bears.
9. Demonstrate how electrical and other utility boxes and facilities will be screened from public view.[Section 4.12.070.A.2.d]
Response: Refer to landscape drawings for screening info.
10. Provide the typical architectural exterior materials of each building type for compliance review with LUDC Section 4.10.030.B.
Response: See revised plan set for more information.
11. Provide materials and colors for the trash enclosures. [Section 4.10.030.B]
Response: See revised drawings including trash enclosure materials and colors.
12. If rooftop vents or flues are anticipated, they should be shown in the architectural plans of this MDP. [LUDC Table 4.02-2 Height Limit Exceptions]
Response: No flues or chimneys are included in the designs for this project and as such the roofs shall be the highest elements of the buildings.
13. Per Section 4.10.040.B.4, No more than 75 percent of a building façade or other wall facing a public street shall be comprised of a single façade material. The remaining 25 percent of the façade shall incorporate a different material. It appears that this requirement is met; however, demonstrate that this requirement is met for the residential units along Mt. Hope Circle.
Response: See revised building elevations and Exterior Material Schedule for more info.



14. The enclosed trash storage areas are allowed within the setback so long as the enclosure is not covered, and the fences or walls meet the allowed fence height. The proposed trash enclosures need to be relocated out of the building setback or redesigned to be an uncovered structure. The trash receptacles shall be enclosed by a six-foot solid material that is constructed using similar materials to the primary building(s) on the site. [Section 4.11.060.B.3.c]

Response: See revised drawings for more information.

Landscape Plan:

1. Refer to the attached markup of the Landscape drawings for additional comments.

Response: All landscape comments have been addressed.

2. To facilitate the review, include a sheet index on the first page or the cover page that delineates the sheet location of the landscape plan, Hardscape plan, snow storage plan, plant schedule, and irrigation plan.

Response: A sheet index has been added to sheet LS-001

3. The Haymeadow PUD states that the Haymeadow Metropolitan District will own and operate the raw water irrigation system serving the development. Add this statement to the landscape plan key notes, and indicate on the plan that development will use a raw-water irrigation system. Also, provide the documentation stating the approval or water rights for non-potable irrigation water use.

Response: This statement has been added to the general notes #1 on the irrigation plans Sheet LI-001. The approval for non-potable irrigation water is documented in Section 8.2.2 of the Haymeadow Annexation and Development Agreement (ADA), which states:

8.2.2. A raw water irrigation system, built by Developer or the Metropolitan District and owned, operated, maintained and repaired by Developer/property owners association or the Metropolitan District as set forth below, shall service certain landscaping irrigation, including but not limited to, parks and recreation areas, yard area within multi-family projects, fire station landscaping, open space corridor irrigation, landscaped public rights of-way, and pasture irrigation requirements ("Raw Water Irrigation System"), for a total irrigated area not to exceed approximately three hundred twenty (320) acres to be specified in writing by the Town and Developer in the lease back agreement described herein. Developer or the Metropolitan District shall submit to the Town for approval a Raw Water Irrigation Operations Plan. The areas irrigated by the Raw Water Irrigation System may be reduced or decreased during low flow stream conditions at the Town's discretion in accordance with the obligations of the Developer under the Brush Creek Watershed Management Plan ("BCWMP"). If necessary, the BCWMP shall be amended by Town to include low flow condition protocols for operation of the Raw Water Irrigation System and shall be binding on the owner and operator of the Raw Water Irrigation System. As set forth above in subsection 8.1.1, the irrigation water necessary to serve this Raw Water Irrigation System shall be leased by the Town back to Developer, the property owners association or the Metropolitan District.

A tracking table is provided below showing the total allowance for non-potable irrigation water, per the ADA, and the amount currently allocated to Neighborhood A1, as documented by SGM in the December 2025 Haymeadow Hybrid Raw Water System Master Plan Report.



Neighborhood	Type *	Total Irrigated Area (acres)
A1	SF	6.31
A1	RMF	6.15
A1	Parks	-
A1	OS	31.24
A1	RoW	2.68
Total A1		46.38

4. Provide impervious coverage calculations for each lot. Ensure the calculations follow the definition of the LUDC, including driveways, buildings, decks, sidewalks, parking, streets, and paved areas. The calculations should include the entire lot, but the acreage for each Cottage court doesn't align with the lot size provided on the proposed plat.

Response: Impervious coverage calculations have been added to the Civil Drawing set.

5. The landscape plan states that the 17 single-family lots are "not a part of". Though the homes are not being constructed yet, the landscape plan needs to include the 17 single-family lots. Per the civil plan, there are utilities and grading improvements on these lots. Show grading, revegetation/reseeding, etc, on the landscape plan. Section 4.10.060.C.2]

Response: Viewports have been adjusted and revegetation is now shown for all disturbed areas on the single-family lots.

6. Included the impervious surface calculations for the single-family lot. They can be labeled as "To be determined with Building Permit."

Response: The note "To be determined with Building Permit" has been added for impervious surface calculations for single-family lots.

7. Per the Haymeadow PUD Guide, "the required buffering within the public rights-of-way shall be measured as 25 linear feet on average." Demonstrate how this is met on Mt. Hope Circle.

Response: There is no public right-of-way included in this submittal.

8. Demonstrate that there are clear vision areas on the landscape plan. If there are plantings in the clear-view area, ensure they are labeled with the plant type so plant height can be determined. [Section 4.02.040.A.]

Response: Clear vision areas have been added to the plans and are clear of vegetation per Section 4.02.040.A.

9. Labeled locations and calculations for amounts for all of the required landscaping. [Section 4.11.030.A]

Response: Landscape label locations and calculations have been included.

10. On the plans, note which plants are on the CSU Extension Office Landscape proposals. When using plant materials not on the CSU list, provide information in the plant/landscape notes describing how the proposed plant types are low-water, drought-tolerant, and FireWise. [Section 4.11.030; <https://extension.colostate.edu/resource/firewise-plant-materials/>].

Response: We have been working with an ecologist to finalize a plant list that utilizes a diverse range of species to meet the intent of these requirements. We have added water use, drought-tolerant and Firewise compliance information to the landscape plan on Sheet LS-002.



11. Include turf sod/grass calculations in the landscape plan. The limit on turf for the proposed development will be determined by Table 4.11-1: Use of Turf Grass By Zone District for Residential Low and Medium. The limit is 2,500 square feet per unit.
Response: There is no turf or sod grass proposed within this development.
12. Trees require a minimum caliper of three inches. Revise the tree species that meet this requirement. [Section 4.11.030.B.2]
Response: Tree caliper has been updated.
13. Indicate the sizing of the proposed shrubs on the landscape plan using gallons as the metric. The minimum is 5 gallons. [Section 4.11.030.B.2]
Response: #5 is the updated industry standard and is noted on the plant schedule. This is the same size as 5 gallons.
14. A landscape area shall be established along all streets between public right-of-way and any buildings, parking lots, loading areas, storage areas, screening walls or fences, or other improvements in association with any use. The 10-foot required landscape area between Mt. Hope Circle and the single-family lots.
 - a. The required landscaped areas shall be planted at the rate of one tree per 25 square feet for all streets in the required landscaped area. Provide the tree and shrub count calculations on each sheet of the landscaped area where there is public ROW. [Section 4.11.030.C.2.]**Response: We are meeting all ROW planting requirements along Mt. Hope Circle, per the approved landscape plan for Phase 2, Neighborhood A1. Within the 10' additional buffer area adjacent to the ROW, we are meeting the planting requirements for all unobstructed portions of the buffer area, but we are unable to plant within certain areas of this 10' buffer zone, which are obstructed by easements, utilities and site triangles. A Buffer Landscaping Exhibit is included in the resubmittal materials illustrating the obstructed and unobstructed sections of the landscape buffer and the proposed plantings within the unobstructed areas.**
15. Highlight the plant species on the hardscape plan to facilitate the review of Section 4.11.060.B.1, which states, all mechanical equipment, either ground-mounted or located on a rooftop, shall be screened from the view of a person standing on the property line on the far side of an adjacent public street. Or call out the ground-mounted utilities on the landscape plan. Depict the location of ground-mounted mechanical equipment, such as heating and cooling outdoor units.
Response: All mechanical equipment has been appropriately screened per Section 4.11.060.B.1.
16. If any permanent signs are proposed, such as a subdivision identification sign or signs depicting home addresses, show and identify the location signs in the landscape or hardscape plan. [Section 4.11.030.A]
Response: No permanent signs are proposed at this time.
17. Ensure that all updated landscape design complies with easement restrictions.
Response: All updated landscape design complies with easement restrictions.

Lighting Plan:

1. Maximum lighting output levels are 0.3 foot candles. The lighting plan and fixtures need to be revised so it's output levels remain at 0.3 foot candles or less. [Section 4.13.040, Table 4.13-1: Maximum Lighting Output Levels]
Response: This revision has been made. New plans are included.

Bicycle Parking Plan:

1. Show the calculation for the total number of bicycle parking spaces provided, their location, and how they are being provided (i.e, rack, storage unit, or locker). If the bicycle parking spaces are provided



by a storage unit, demonstrate that the storage units are appropriately sized. [Section 4.12.050, Table 4.12-3: Bicycle Parking]

Response: A Bicycle Parking plan has been added to Sheet LP-404 and calculations for the total number of bicycle parking spaces provided, their location, and how they are being provided has been included. The plans have been designed to comply with all relevant bicycle parking regulations.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT REVIEW COMMENTS

Plan General Comments:

1. Consider modifying the pedestrian connectivity to better connect the buildings to the onsite amenities and surrounding pedestrian/trail network with minimizing vehicle/pedestrian conflict points on the private roadway.
Response: The plans have been revised to add connections from the proposed development to the Spine Trail and adjacent sidewalks, in accordance with these comments and suggestions, and to provide interior pedestrian/bicycle lanes along the interior roadways.
2. Verify with the fire department if the fire hydrant layout around the site is acceptable.
Response: We have reached out to the fire department via email (on 12/9/25) but have not received a response. As part of the referral and review process for this resubmittal, we ask staff to please refer this application to the fire department and facilitate a meeting with this referral agency to ensure the application complies with all applicable fire code requirements.
3. Verify coordination between landscape plans and civil water and sewer service plans to not locate trees over service lines or mains.
Response: Utilities have been coordinated between Civil and Landscape drawings to avoid conflicts.
4. Additional plan commentary is noted on the plan sheets and can be found at the link below.
Response: Additional plan commentary has been addressed accordingly. Thank you.

Subdivision Plat and SIA Comments:

5. SIA needs to have sections indicating the development's ownership if the internal site stormwater improvements and the sections of Sewer Main that will be privately owned and maintained.
Response: A markup of the overall utility plan is included in the resubmittal materials showing proposed public and private ownership of site infrastructure and utilities. Once agreed upon with Town staff, the final version of this document can be included in the SIA as an exhibit.
6. Update the water sewer and drainage easements on the plan for any changes in alignment.
Response: The easements have been updated to reflect changes in alignment.
7. Additional comments are made on the plans see the link in item 4.
Response: We have reviewed these comments and addressed them accordingly.

BLM REFERRAL COMMENTS

1. The Vail Valley Mountain Trails Alliance and Hardscrabble Trails Coalition did reach out to us regarding this proposal. Because there are plans / ideas for an additional trailhead (on private land) and further trail development (on BLM lands), our comment is that we would like to ensure there is coordination with the BLM on all trail planning with our office - especially trails that cross on to BLM-managed lands.



Response: The applicant will continue to work with the BLM and maintain coordination on trails planning.

CDOT REFERRAL COMMENTS

No comments.

Response: Thank you for your review of our application.

COLORADO GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The available referral documents include the following reports not previously reviewed by CGS:

- “Comments Regarding Debris Flow Mitigation Design, Proposed Haymeadow Development – Filing 1, Brush Creek Road, Eagle, Colorado (H-P Kumar Project No. 17-7-676, December 6, 2018), and
- Geotechnical Engineering Investigation, Haymeadow Filing 2, Lots 1, 3-12, 14-35, and 44-53, Eagle, Colorado (CTL Thompson Project No. GS06765.005-120-R1, September 16, 2025.)

CTL’s report contains a valid characterization of subsurface conditions and makes appropriate recommendations regarding site development, foundations, floor systems, surface drainage, use of sulfate attack-resistant cement in project concrete, etc. Provided CTL’s recommendations are rigorously adhered to, CGS has no objection to approval of DR25-08 and FP25-01. However, our previous Haymeadow review comments remain valid:

CGS reviewed Haymeadow referrals in 2013, 2018, 2022, 2024, and earlier in 2025. Our concerns regarding debris inundation hazard mitigation were satisfactorily addressed in 2018 via:

- Letter to Kevin McCoy – RE: Haymeadow Subdivision Filing 1 Final Plat, Eagle, CO; CGS Unique No. EA-14-0005, Debris Pond (Alpine Engineering, December 10, 2018),
- Memo to Vern Brock, PE (Town of Eagle): Haymeadow Drainage Report Debris Pond Supplemental Information (Alpine Engineering, November 8, 2018), and
- Haymeadow Filing 1 Debris Flow Mitigation Pond and Swale Operation and Maintenance (Alpine Engineering, December 3, 2018).

CGS has also previously reviewed:

- Geotechnical Study, Haymeadow Development, Eagle, Colorado (Cesare, Inc. Project No. 21.5057, January 31, 2022),
- Supplemental Subsoil Study for Site Grading and Pavement Section Design, Proposed Haymeadow Phase A1 Development (H-P/Kumar Project No. 17-7-676, March 21, 2018),
- Debris Flow and Flood Review, Proposed Haymeadow Development (HP Geotech Job No. 113 097A, June 12, 2013), and
- Debris Flow and Flood Mitigation Design Information for the Small Tributary Drainage Basins at the Proposed Phase A1 Development, Haymeadow Development, Brush Creek Road, Eagle, Colorado (HP Geotech July 11, 2013).

All previously reviewed and agreed-upon Haymeadow mitigation, including debris inundation hazard mitigation pond(s) and swale(s), must be constructed and maintained in accordance with the project engineers’ recommendations.

Response: Noted.

COLORADO PARKS AND WILDLIFE REFERRAL COMMENTS

CPW does not have any major concerns with these proposed changes because they are internal parcels of the existing A1 Neighborhood. While this particular parcel is not impacting our mapped High Priority Habitat,



wildlife in the surrounding areas, both developed and undeveloped, utilize this area for movement between critical habitats used for winter concentration, production areas, and summer feeding grounds.

Response: Thank you for your review of our development application. We have reviewed and will incorporate your recommendations to minimize the potential for human-wildlife conflict throughout the development.

EAGLE COUNTY

Planning Division:

1. No comments

Response: Thank you for your review.

Engineering Comments:

1. No Comments

Response: Thank you for your review.

Open Space and Natural Resources Comments:

1. In reference to elements of the Eagle County Comprehensive Plan below, Eagle County Open Space and Natural Resources staff recommend the following:
 - a. Wildlife Concerns 3.7.3.e - Where disturbances to wildlife habitat cannot be avoided, development should be required to fully mitigate potential negative impacts. 3.7.5.g - Wildlife friendly measures should be incorporated into the design of individual home sites and neighborhoods. 3.7.5.h - Measures designed to protect wildlife from contact with human activities and disturbances should be implemented and enforced.

To reduce human-wildlife conflict, Eagle County staff discourage the use of the following acorn/fruit-bearing trees and shrubs: Common Hackberry, Gambel Oak, Serviceberry, Peking Cotoneaster, and Golden Currant listed in the Plant Schedule in the Landscape Plan. These tree and shrub species produce acorns and fruits, which serve as an attractant and food source for bears. Eagle County staff recommend replacing these trees and shrubs with species that do not produce fruit attractive to bears.

Response: We have been working with an ecologist to finalize a plant list that utilizes a diverse range of species to meet the intent of these requirements.

Assessor's Office Comments:

1. The acreage in the Certificate of Dedication and Ownership, in the second paragraph, should be 10.791 (the sum of Tracts RMF-4-A and RMF-5). 468.812 is the acreage for Tract Z1-A.

Response: This change has been made.

2. Rounding issue, but the acreages in the Land Use Table add to 10.791

Response: Consistency in rounding has been applied throughout the revised plans.

HOUSING SPECIALIST COMMENTS

Following a review of the project narrative, I believe the application is consistent with the Town's adopted planning documents and meets the outstanding housing obligations for this portion of the Haymeadow PUD. For consideration, it may be helpful for the applicant to include Ordinance 13, Series 2021 (attached), which documents the addition of the 30 Resident Occupied (RO) units to Haymeadow's overall housing commitment which was originally limited to only 84 LERP units. Including this information would provide a full picture of the neighborhood's deed-restricted requirements and inventory.

Response: Ordinance 13, Series 2021 has been included in the resubmittal materials, as suggested.



SURVEYOR COMMENTS

Sheet 1 of 5

1. Please include a closure report for the boundary.
Response: A closure report has been provided, as requested.
2. Title commitment in notes should be updated to ABC50073573-12, effective date 7-31-25base on the current commitment provided.
Response: This has been updated.
3. 4th line in the Certificate of Dedication - Haymeadow Filing 1l should be Haymeadow Filing 1
Response: This has been addressed on the updated Plat.
4. The acreage labeled in the Certificate of Dedication notes 468.812 acres and the Land Use Summary notes 470.027 acres?
Response: This has been addressed on the updated Plat.

Sheet 2 of 5

1. Typical Lot Setback and Dry Utility Easement Detail should be updated to the Lots on this plat.
Response: This has been addressed on the updated Plat.