# TOWN OF WINTER PARK <br> PLANNING COMMISSION <br> Tuesday, April 26, 2022 8:00 AM 

## AGENDA

I. Meeting Call to Order
II. Roll Call of Commission Members
III. Town Hall Meeting (time for anyone from the public to speak about items not on the agenda)
IV. Minutes: April 12, 2022
V. Conflicts of Interest
VI. Action Items:
A. Design Review Single-Family Detached - 499 Kings Crossing Road (PLN21-126)
B. Amendment to Design Review Single-Family Attached - Row at Roam (PLN20-045)
C. PUBLIC HEARING: Minor Subdivision Plat - Replat of Tract F, River Walk at Winter Park Filing No. 1 and unplatted property known as Idlewild Subdivision Exemption No. 1 (PLN22-024) (PLN22-039)
D. PUBLIC HEARING: Preliminary Plat - Sojourn at Idlewild (PLN21-127)
E. PUBLIC HEARING: Unified Development Code - Proposed Amendments to Town Code Titles 5 - Public Ways and Property, 6 - Building Regulations, 7 - Zoning, and 8 Subdivision Regulations (PLN19-020)
VII. Planning Commission Items for Discussion

## VIII: Director's Report:

A. May 10 - Training on new email procedures

If members of the public wish to attend the meeting digitally the link is below. The meeting will continue in person regardless of technical difficulties with Zoom.

## Computer Log-In Instructions

Please click the link below to join the webinar:
https://us02web.zoom.us/i/81725744995?pwd=RnVOb2hpVmN1SXBydzFBZEc3NGhGZz09
Passcode: 113389
Phone Log-In Instructions
Dial In Numbers
US: +1 6699006833 or +1 2532158782 or +1 3462487799 or +1 9294362866 or +1 3017158592
or +1 3126266799
Webinar ID: 81725744995
Passcode: 113389
International numbers available: https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kdbXDkFiYy
You can $\log$ into the Zoom meeting through the link above to view what is projected on the screen. You can use either your computer audio or the number above. Everyone will be muted upon entry into the meeting to ensure that we have manageable background noise and limited interruptions.

## Public Hearing Process

If you would like to participate in the public hearing, please follow these instructions so we can make sure everyone that wants to speak has the opportunity. When you log into Zoom you will be automatically muted to limit background noise. When the public hearing is opened for public comment, please use the "raise your hand" feature and staff will unmute citizens in the order they were received. To enable "raise your hand" feature, click on the "Participants" button the bottom of the screen.

# TOWN OF WINTER PARK PLANNING COMMISSION <br> 'Tuesday, April 12, 2022 8:00 AM 

## MINUTE

I. Meeting Call to Order. The Planning Commission meeting starts at 8:05 am.
II. Roll Call of Commission Members. Roll Call indicated present Chairman Brad Holzwarth, Commissioners Dave Barker, Roger Kish, Jonathan Larson, Angela Sandstrom, Mike Davlin and Doug Robbins. Community Development Director James Shockey and Town Planner Hugh Bell are also present.
III. Town Hall Meeting (time for anyone from the public to speak about items not on the agenda). No one comes forward.
IV. Minutes: March 22, 2022. Commissioner Kish makes a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Davlin seconds. The minutes are approved 7, 0.
V. Conflicts of Interest. No one comes forward.

## VI. Action Items:

A. Amendment to Design Review Commercial - Après Winter Park - 78415 Highway 40
(PLN22-021)
Town Planner Hugh Bell begins his presentation. Planner Bell goes over the main elements for this Commercial Design Review. There are no variance requests associated with this application. Planner Bell mentions some details about the windows along some other items that need to be addressed by the applicant in order to be satisfactory such as pedestrian access and circulation. Then, Planner Bell mentions the conditions (9) for approval. This information is outlined on the Staff Report sent to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Kish asks about the entry and the second story. Planner Bell shows on the screen the elevation. After watching the renderings more closely, it is determined that this fulfills one of the conditions. Then, the Commission and the Staff discuss the retaining wall. The applicant has done some changes to the landscaping plan.

Then, the conversation goes over the parking item. The Staff and the Commission discuss the parking requirements for this project since there are residential units involved. Then, there is a short discussion about the picture of the alley.
The applicant, Mr. Gabe Bellowe from Munn Architecture comes forward. Mr. Bellowe explains more in detail the scope of this project making emphasis on the use of the retail spaces. Mr. Bellowe goes more in detail about the floorplan of the residential units. Later, Mr. Bellowe makes some clarifications about the landscaping.

The Commission asks the applicant about the schedule for the next phase. Mr. Bellowe says that they are thinking about submitting soon but this depends on the budget. The object of this question is to set guidelines for the landscape. The Commission also discuss the pedestrian area on one of the sides of the building. The Commission is concerned about emergency access vehicles for this side of the building. The applicant explains how these upper floor units will be occupied. The Commission, the Staff and the applicant discuss the parking reduction topic. There is mention of four (4) parking spaces. The applicant explains how these parking spaces will be managed. The Staff says that the applicant has fulfilled the parking spaces requirement for the one-bedroom units. The conversation moves to the tandem parking
spaces and their relation to the three-bedroom units. The Commission, the Staff and the applicant also discuss the commercial parking spaces requirements. There is a discussion about vehicle traffic. The applicant says that they have not thought about any kind of railing. Mr. Bellowe also mentions patio access.

The Commission would the applicant to have the number of bedrooms per unit in writing. The Commission also asks about the doors on one the elevations and where they lead to. Mr. Bellowe talks about the storage units related to these doors.
The floor plan presented today is not the updated one. The applicant explains the changes they will make to the floor plans. There is a discussion about the lack of egress for some of the bedrooms. The applicant says they are thinking about removing some of the walls to encourage proper use and have the required egress. The Commission can ask for continuation so the applicant can have time to make the necessary updates and changes.

There is mention of getting the Fire Department involved in order to make sure there is proper access for emergency vehicles. The Commission requires a referral letter from the Fire Department or any other emergency agency. The Commission asks the applicant about egress and emergency access for the lower level. The Commission asks about the location of the FDC. There is a conversation about how to address this topic for different parts of the mixed used complex. The Commission would like to see a diagram along with the referral letter as a condition for approval. The Commission also points out that the Building Division and the Fire Department will review the plans eventually. There is a conversation about traffic and possible scenarios. There is also mention of the timeline.
Mr. Scott Munn from Munn Architecture comes forward. He makes some clarifications about the retaining wall, egress, access, alley configuration and public and residents' safety. Mr. Munn states that they can provide more information for a later time. Planner Bell says that the Town Engineer can review this application.
There is a conversation about the reasons for changing the doors due to safety concerns. The condominiums are to be sold not rented. The Commission discussed possible scenarios which include handicap access. Mr. Munn says that there is an ADA accessible unit proposed on the first level. The main level is still on a conceptual mode. The Commission goes back to the sliding doors topic. The Commission would like more details about this topic.
Commissioner Davlin makes a motion to approve Commercial Design Review with Staff recommendations adding the review from the Town Engineer as a condition. Commissioner Barker seconds. The Commercial Design Review is approved 6, 1.

## B. PUBLIC HEARING: Preliminary Plat - Sojourn at Idlewild (PLN21-127)

Director Shockey says that a public hearing is not necessary but a motion is.
Commissioner Kish makes a motion to continue on the proposed date (April 26, 2022) for this Preliminary Plat. Commissioner Barker seconds. The Preliminary Plat continuation is approved 7, 0.

## C. PUBLIC HEARING: Special Use Permit Request - No street address - Kona Ice of Peaks and Valleys (PLN22-022)

Town Planner Hugh Bell begins his presentation. This is a Special Use Permit request for a food truck adjacent to Hideaway Park. The applicant has submitted this same Special Use Permit in previous years and there has not been records of negative impact. This information is outlined on the Staff Report sent to the Commissioners. Then, Planner Bell mentions the conditions (17) for approval.

There is a short discussion about parking on private property. The applicant Mr. Karl Vogelbacher comes forward. Mr. Vogelbacher summarizes his request to the Commission.

Commissioner Baker makes a motion to approve and move this Special Use Permit to the Town Council with Staff recommendations. Commissioner Kish seconds. The Special Use Permit is approved 7, 0.
D. PUBLIC HEARING: Unified Development Code - Proposed Amendments to Town Code Titles 5 - Public Ways and Property, 6 - Building Regulations, 7 - Zoning, and 8 Subdivision Regulations (PLN19-020)

Director Shockey informs the Commission that the final draft is ready. Director Shockey shows a table that illustrates the updates made. The goal is to make the information easier to find for applicants. The Commission would like some information resubmitted since some of it could not to be accessed. Director Shockey will resubmit this information.

The public hearing session is open. No one comes forward.
Director Shockey asks the Commission how they would like to review the information. Director Shockey and the Commission discuss some of the information that is in the document. Planner Bell explains how they came up with some of the data on the document. The Commission and the Staff have a conversation about some information applied to Roam and Rendezvous. The Commission has a conversation about the language and some guidelines, sign code, protection of wildlife corridors and some other items. Director Shockey says that some studies will be required. Director Shockey says that these topics can be discussed at the workshop to be held next week with the Council. The members of the Commission and the Staff discuss this in more detail and how some items can be resolved to avoid going back to the same topics several times. Director Shockey also talks about the conversations that he and the Town Manager have had regarding the content of the UDC.

The Commission has a conversation about the content of the document and how they can make it more precise. They mention some examples like tree placement and wildlife corridors. They also mention the probable impact this would have on the applicants.

Director Shockey goes over the public comments the Staff has received. He shows on the screen some examples. Mr. Vogel is the person who has sent the most comprehensive comments so far. The Commissioners read the comments on the screen since they were not able to access this information. Director Shockey will make sure that they get this information soon. There is mention about the use of fences to delineate property lines. Director Shockey goes over some of the other comments by the public.

The Commission and the Staff go over some items and they make notes about some adjustments the Commission proposes. Then, the Staff and the Commission study Section 2 B-4 Accessory Uses and Structures. There is a conversation about height, boundary lines, screening and some others.
Then, Director Shockey goes back to the comments Mr. Vogel submitted. There is a discussion about condominium hotel type. Director Shockey shows on the screen Table 2-B-1-2 so they can all have a conversation about the content of the table and its relation to the comments submitted. The Commission and the Staff also discuss possible scenarios. There is also mention of building separation, driveways, Hotel/Motel regulations, zoning, ground level equipment and some other items.

After a five-minute break, the meeting moves over the comments regarding landscape requirements and building coverage. To illustrate this better, Director Shockey shows some images on the screen so the Commissioners can analyze them. Other topics being discussed is setback reductions, primary and secondary materials, permitted materials, vehicle access (including emergency vehicles), protection of hillsides and ridgelines, slope restrictions when it comes to construction, pedestrian improvements, and paving materials. The Commission Members ask the Staff to send the comments and the document so they can review after this meeting.

Director Shockey shows the Commission how to access the redline version on the Town of Winter Park website.

This was only a discussion topic, no motion was made.

## VII. Planning Commission Items for Discussion:

Director Shockey says that there are no items for discussion.

## VIII: Director's Report

There are not items to discuss.
Upon a previously approved motion, the Planning Commission meeting is adjourned at 11:16 am.

| TO | Planning Commission |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM | Hugh Bell, Planner |
| THROUGH | James Shockey, Community Development Director |
| DATE | April 26, 2022 |
| RE | Single-Family Detached Design Review - Lot 12A, Whiting Tracts - 499 Kings Crossing |
|  | Road (PLN21-126) |

## Applicant: Lauren Searcy

Owner: Lauren Searcy and Benjamin Kaplan
Architect: Cassie Turbow, AIA
Zoning: R-2 (Multiple Family Residential)

## Authority:

Pursuant to § 2-1-4 of the Winter Park Town Code (the "Code"), the Planning Commission considers building configurations, colors, materials and general compatibility of proposed structures and outdoor advertising within the Town of Winter Park. Design approval is required before issuance of a building permit.

## Variance:

N/A. No administrative or Board of Adjustment (BOA) variance requests are included with the application.

## Architectural:

New additions to an existing single-family detached home. Additions include a patio, foyer, vestibule, and attached garage with two (2) garage spaces with a building footprint of 495 sq . ft.

## Title Commitment:

N/A. Ownership is unchanged.

## Homeowner's Association Review:

N/A. This property is not governed by a HOA.

## Material and Color:

Unsatisfactory. Materials and colors not indicated for entry doors and garage doors.
> Applicant shall indicate materials and colors for entry doors and garage doors.

## Exterior Lighting:

Unsatisfactory. One exterior luminaire is proposed but a specification sheet was not provided for staff to ensure dark-sky compliance. Photometric plans are not required for single-family homes.

| Fixture Name | Proposed \# <br> of Fixtures | Proposed <br> Lumens | Proposed <br> CCT |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Hampton Bay <br> Black Barn <br> Sconce | 4 | $?$ | $?$ |

> Applicant shall submit specification sheet for a dark-sky compliant luminaire for staff's review.

## Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU):

N/A

## Site Plan:

Satisfactory.

## Building Elevations:

```
Satisfactory.
```


## Setbacks:

Partially satisfactory. See "Parking" below. R -2 setbacks are as follows: 25 ' front setback; 5 ' side setbacks with 3 ' added for each story above the first; and $20^{\prime}$ rear setback.

## Building Coverage:

Satisfactory. Proposed building coverage is $\sim 18 \%$ which conforms with the $40 \%$ limit.

## Building Height:

Unsatisfactory. Only proposed grade is depicted on elevation drawings. It appears the building is well under the maximum permitted midpoint building height of 35 ' but revised elevations will be necessary for staff to confirm.
> Applicant shall indicate existing and proposed grades on elevation drawings for staff to properly measure building height; staff shall review.

## Parking:

Unsatisfactory. Section 3.9.3(2)(a) in the Standards and Specifications prohibits off-street parking in front yard setbacks and one (1) uncovered parking space is shown encroaching into the front yard setback. However, staff believes this parking configuration is acceptable, as the lot is buffered by a strip of land owned by Silverado II Condos that separates their property from the Kings Crossing Road ROW, no structure is encroaching into the front yard setback, and the garage provides two (2) off-street parking spaces, which is the minimum required number of spaces for single-family homes. The Town Engineer will still need to approve an administrative variance request petitioning to encroach with this parking space.
> If Applicant wishes to keep extra one (1) uncovered off-street parking space where proposed, encroaching into the front yard setback and violating Section 3.9.3(2)(a) in the Standards and Specifications, Applicant shall submit an administrative variance request in accordance with

Section 8.1 to staff, who will forward it to the Town Engineer for his review.

## Land Use Transition Zones and Revegetation:

Satisfactory. No trees or shrubs appear proposed, which are not required but recommended. Several existing trees on the east side of the lot are slated to remain. LTZs are not required for this property. Snow storage does not encroach into landscaping.
> No site clearing shall be permitted until the Building Division has verified the Pre-Disturbance Checklist has been implemented on the site.
> Any disturbed areas on the site shall be revegetated with an appropriate seed mix per the Single Family / Duplex Deposit Agreement.

## Snow Storage:

Unsatisfactory. 188 sq . ft. (25\%) are required but snow storage is not depicted on a site plan exhibit. Calculation is taken from total asphalt area dimension. 3.11 of the Standards requires that a minimum of $25 \%$ of all driving surfaces (including gravel shoulders), parking areas, and pedestrian walkways is provided as snow storage.
> Applicant shall add proposed snow storage areas to a site plan exhibit for staff's review.

## Erosion Control / Drainage Plan / Drainage Report / Grading / Engineer Review:

## Satisfactory.

> Approved drainage and erosion control shall be in place prior to and throughout site preparation and construction and through successful revegetation.

## Driveway:

N/A. Driveway is not proposed for alteration.

## Utility Review: <br> N/A

## Wetlands:

N/A

## Inspection:

Building Division Staff have not performed a Pre-Disturbance inspection of the property.
> No site clearing shall be permitted until the Building Division has verified the Pre-Disturbance Checklist has been implemented on the site.

## Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the Single-Family Detached Design Review - Lot 12A, Whiting Tracts - 499 Kings Crossing Road (PLN21-126) with the following conditions:

1. Applicant shall indicate materials and colors for entry doors and garage doors.
2. Applicant shall submit specification sheet for a dark-sky compliant luminaire for staff's review.
3. Applicant shall indicate existing and proposed grades on elevation drawings for staff to properly measure building height; staff shall review.
4. If Applicant wishes to keep extra one (1) uncovered off-street parking space where proposed, encroaching into the front yard setback and violating Section 3.9.3(2)(a) in the Standards and Specifications, Applicant shall submit an administrative variance request in accordance with Section 8.1 to staff, who will forward it to the Town Engineer for his review.
5. No site clearing shall be permitted until the Building Division has verified the Pre-Disturbance Checklist has been implemented on the site.
6. Any disturbed areas on the site shall be revegetated with an appropriate seed mix per the Single Family / Duplex Deposit Agreement.
7. Applicant shall add proposed snow storage areas to a site plan exhibit for staff's review.
8. Approved drainage and erosion control shall be in place prior to and throughout site preparation and construction and through successful revegetation.
9. No site clearing shall be permitted until the Building Division has verified the Pre-Disturbance Checklist has been implemented on the site.

## Required Permits:

$\checkmark$ Building Permit
$\checkmark$ SFD/Duplex Deposit Agreement

## SINGLE-FAMILY/TWO-FAMILY ATTACHED (DUPLEX) DESIGN REVIEW SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST

This application lists the content and format of the submittal requirements to initiate the Design Review process. An incomplete application will not be accepted. A meeting with the Planning Commission is part of the design review process.

## ABSOLUTELY NO WORK, INCLUDING TREE REMOVAL, IS TO COMMENCE ON A SITE/LOT UNTIL YOU HAVE RECEIVED APPROVAL FROM THE TOWN PLANNER.

Applications must be received by Town staff no later than two weeks prior to the Planning Commission meeting. The Commission meets on the second and fourth Tuesday of the month at 8 a.m.

Property Address \&/or Legal Description:
499 Kings Crossing Rd., Winter Park, CO 80482

Property Owner:
Lauren Searcy and Benjamin Kaplan

Applicant (if other than property owner):
Phone: 415-706-8117
Phone 2: 303-396-8374
Email: roxyblu@gmail.com

## Applicant's Certification Statement: I, Lauren Searcy

 , as Applicant and duly representative of the owner, hereby certify that the information included upon the attached Elevation, Landscape, Site, and Grading Plans are true and accurate; and that the development of the site will occur in accordance with the Plan.Lauren Searcy
3/21/2022
Signature
Date

## Staff Use Only

Approval Statement: The attached Elevation, Landscape, Site, and Grading Plans have been reviewed by the Planning Division who find that:
[ ] Design Review Fee, \$100: Check \#
[ ] Deposit Agreement, $\$ 2,000$ deposit: Check \#
[ ] Driveway Permit Deposit, \$1,000 deposit: Check \#___
[ ] Driveway Permit Fee, \$50: Check \# $\qquad$
] The Applicant is permitted to proceed to Building Permit review.
[ ] Subject to the following conditions the Applicant is permitted to proceed to Building Permit review:
[ ] DENIED, based upon the following reasons:

Town Staff

Date Rec'd
Date Rec'd
Date Rec'd
Date Rec'd
$\qquad$ -

Town Staff
Date

Initials
Initials
$\qquad$
Initials Initials $\qquad$

If you have questions, please call the Planning Division at (970)726-8081, ext. 5

APPLICANT
INITIALS
STAFF
INITIALS

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## SUBMITTALREQUIREMENTS

I. RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURAL GUIDELINES AND DESIGN

REGULATIONS: It is very important that you review this document when designing your home and PRIOR to submittal to the Town. Please use the following link on our website www.wpgov.com - Government, Community Development, Planning, Reports / Guidelines.
II. STAFF \& PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW:
A. Review submittals to be PDF format and shall include any amendments requested by Staff or Planning Commissioners must be shown on the plans.

1. Narrative
2. Material Board
3. Title Commitment
4. HOA Architectural Control Committee Letter of Approval
5. Building Elevations
6. Site Plan
7. Grading/Drainage Plan
8. Erosion/Sediment Control Plan
9. Landscape/Revegetation Plan
10. Exterior Lighting Plan
11. Driveway Permit Application
III. NARRATIVE:
A. Name of proposed project, street address, subdivision, and lot number
B. Name, address, email, and telephone numbers of:
12. Owner
13. Applicant
14. Homeowner's Association
15. Project Manager
16. Architect
17. Engineer
18. Surveyor
19. Land Planner
C. Legal description of site
D. Variances granted by the Board of Adjustment (attach signed copy)
E. Zone district (e.g. R-1, R-2)
F. Setback distances
20. Front
21. Sides
22. Rear
G. Parking
23. As required by project per zone district
24. As provided by proposed project

499 Kings Crossing - Design Review Narrative
3/21/2022

Project Description: The proposed project at 499 Kings Crossing includes the addition of a 2-car garage with foyer to attach the garage to the existing house. In addition, a small vestibule is proposed at the existing family room to provide a transition space from the home to new patio with fire feature and hot tub. The proposed structures will match architecturally (finish materials, detailing and roof slope) with the existing structure so that the new elements blend seamlessly with the existing home.
A. 499 Kings Crossing - Garage, Foyer and Vestibule Addition
a. Lot 12A, Whiting Tracts \#1
B. Names and Addresses:

1. Owner and Applicant: Benny Kaplan and Lauren Searcy
a. 499 Kings Crossing Rd, Winter Park, CO 80482
b. 303-396-8374 \& 415-706-8117
2. See \#1
3. Homeowner's Association: NA
4. Project Manager: see \#1
5. Architect: Cassie Turbow, AIA
a. 8189 E $32^{\text {nd }}$ Ave Denver, CO 80238
b. 734-395-9620
6. Engineer: Travis Smith, PE, SE
a. 8189 E $32^{\text {nd }}$ Ave Denver, CO 80238
b. 720-220-8311
7. Surveyor: Western Engineering Consultants; Chadwin Cox, PE
a. 127 South Denver Ave, Fort Lupton, CO 80621
b. 720-685-9951
8. Land Planner: See \#7
C. Legal Description of site:

## LEGAL DESCRIPTION

ALL THAT PART OF THE SW $1 / 4$ OF THE NW1/4 OF SECTION 33, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 75 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M. DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT THE THE SW CORNER OF PARCEL OF LAND DESCRIBED IN DEED RECORDED IN BOOK 114 AT PAGE 485, OF THE RECORDS IN THE RECORDERS OFFICE OF GRAND COUNTY, COLORADO, WHENCE THE WEST $1 / 4$ CORNER OF SECTION 33 BEARS SOUTH 42.42' WEST, A DISTANCE OF 975 FEET; THENCE NORTH A DISTANCE OF 150 FEET; THENCE WEST A DISTANCE OF 150 FEET TO A POINT ON THE WEST BOUNDARY LINE OF SAID PARCEL OF LAND DESCRIBED IN SAID DEED, A DISTANCE OF 150 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

```
COUNTY OF GRAND
```

STATE OF COLORADO
D. Variances Granted by the Board of Adjustment:
E. Zone District: R-1
F. Setback Distances:

1. Front: 25' required: 25'-1" provided
2. Sides: $\mathbf{8}^{\prime}$ required; $62.04^{\prime}, \mathbf{1 8}^{\prime} .42^{\prime}$ and $11.26^{\prime}$ provided
3. Rear: 20 ' required; 49.31' provided
G. Parking
4. Required per R-2 zone district: $\mathbf{2}$ spaces
5. Provided: $\mathbf{2}$ car garage proposed +1 uncovered surface parking area
H. Calculated building coverage ration table:

| LOT DATA TABLE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DESCRIPTION | AREA | AREA (ac) | $\begin{gathered} \text { EXISITNG } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PROPOSED } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| LOT | 22,127 SF | 0.51 | 100 \% | 100 \% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| EXISTING BUILDINGS | 2,065 SF | 0.05 | 9.33\% |  |
| PROPOSED BUILDINGS | 545 SF | 0.01 |  | 2.46 \% |
| TOTAL BUILDING | 2,610 SF | 0.06 |  | 11.80 \% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| EXISTING CONCRETE | 67 SF | 0.00 | 0.30 \% |  |
| EXISTING CONCRETE TBR | 67 SF | 0.00 | 0.30 \% |  |
| PROPOSED CONCRETE | 641 SF | 0.01 |  | 2.90 \% |
| TOTAL CONCRETE | 641 SF | 0.01 |  | 2.90 \% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| EXISTING ASPHALT | 1,103 SF | 0.03 | 4.98 \% |  |
| EXISTING ASPHALT TBR | 736 SF | 0.02 | 3.33 \% |  |
| PROPOSED ASPHALT | 384 SF | 0.01 |  | 1.74 \% |
| TOTAL ASPHALT | 751 SF | 0.02 |  | 3.39 \% |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| EXISTING LANDSCAPE AREA | 18,892 SF | 0.43 | 85.38 \% |  |
| PROPOSED LANDSCAPE AREA | 18,125 SF | 0.42 |  | 81.91 \% |

1. Sites total acreage and square feet; 0.51 acres, $22,127 \mathrm{sf}$
2. Building footprint square footage; $\mathbf{2 , 6 1 0} \mathbf{s f}$
3. Drives, sidewalks and parking areas square footages; 1,392sf
I. Calculated building height: 26'- 6 3/8"
J. Exterior building:
4. Foundation: cast-in-place concrete, painted where exposed above grade
5. Siding: 6" painted wood T\&G siding, to match existing
6. Rock/Masonry: NA
7. Roof: asphalt shingles, to match existing
8. Glass Type: low-E (Andersen $\mathbf{4 0 0}$ series windows)
9. Exterior lighting fixtures: Hampton Bay, black barn sconce complying with cut-off and dark sky requirements




(5) VESTIBULE FRONT ELEVATION $\qquad$ T.O. GARAGE ROOF ${ }_{118^{\prime \prime}} \mathbf{4}^{(0027.08)}$

 T.O. GARAGE PLATE $\underset{106-00^{-1}}{\text { (9013.9) }}$

RAGE REAR ELEVATION









TO Planning Commission<br>FROM Hugh Bell, Planner<br>THROUGH James Shockey, Community Development Director<br>DATE April 26, 2022<br>RE Amendment to Design Review Single-Family Attached - Lots 9-18, Block 5, Roam<br>Subdivision Exemption No. 3-13-49 Ski Idlewild Road (PLN20-045)

Applicant: Adam Dowling on behalf of Ski Idlewild Property, LLC

Architect: Jenna McGregor of MMM Architecture
Zoning: P-D (Planned Development) with D-C (Destination Center) underlay
Authority: Pursuant to § 2-1-4 of the Winter Park Town Code (the "Code"), the Planning Commission considers building configurations, colors, materials and general compatibility of proposed structures and outdoor advertising within the Town of Winter Park. Design approval is required before issuance of a building permit.

## Project Overview:

Applicant is requesting an amendment be granted for their Design Review Application approved at the August 11, 2020 Planning Commission hearing. Applicant requests to revise materials. See "Material and Color" below for details.

## Variance:

N/A

## Architectural:

Existing five (5) structures composed of ten (10) single-family attached dwelling units (DU) with one garage space per DU. Each DU has a building footprint of either 651 sq . ft. or 791 sq . ft.

## Title Commitment:

N/A

## Homeowner's Association Review:

Satisfactory. The Roam Design Review Committee has submitted a letter of approval dated February 18, 2022.

## Material and Color:

The elevations as built do not match those approved with the original Design Review Application. The buildings are highly visible from Highway 40 and are some of the first buildings visible when entering Town from the south side, and staff believes the deviation from what was approved should be amended.

The blackened steel flat metal panel ("blackened panel") is lighter than black and more of a mottled black and brown color and is sectioned into much smaller panels. The original blackened panels were 32 " tall and the installed panels only 18" tall. Applicant states the manufacturer ceased production of the $32 "$ tall blackened panel, which staff finds to be an acceptable reason to install the smaller size. The blackened panel still is in the same location as approved: on the first level, which it wraps the majority of, and on the second and third levels on the end units (i.e., 13 (Lot 18) and 49 (Lot 9) Ski Idlewild Road), which were approved with a small (less than six-inch (6")) articulation ("façade articulation") that highlighted several windows in the center of those units' elevations. Staff is dissatisfied with this material change.

From correspondence staff had with the architect of record dated December 10, 2021 (attached), a possible solution discussed involved painting the blackened panels black with a special paint, and then using corrugated corten panels ("corten panels") oriented either vertically or horizontally (staff prefers vertically) in between each vertical stack of windows on the façade articulation. The wood board and batten, much of the corten panels, and much of the windows are oriented vertically, so staff believes the blackened panel should link the top and bottoms of the windows on these façade articulations. See attached a visual reference clouded in red from staff.

Painting the blackened panels is a less arduous method to match the elevation with what was proposed rather than removing and replacing the existing blackened panels with panels matching what was proposed. Additionally, there are existing vertical corten panels which could be applied to the areas not using the blackened panel on the façade articulations. See attached a visual reference clouded in red from staff. See material board for details.

## Exterior Lighting: <br> N/A

## Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU):

N/A

## Site Plan:

N/A

## Building Elevations:

See "Material and Color", above.

## Setbacks:

N/A

## Building Coverage:

N/A

## Building Height:

N/A

## Parking:

## Land Use Transition Zones (LTZs) and Revegetation: N/A

## Snow Storage:

N/A

## Erosion Control / Drainage Plan / Drainage Report / Grading / Engineer Review: N/A

## Driveway:

N/A

## Utility Review: <br> N/A

## Wetlands: <br> N/A

## Pre-Disturbance Inspection: <br> N/A

## Discussion Items:

1. The Planning Commission shall discuss whether to permit the revised blackened steel flat metal panel ("blackened panel") in lieu of that which was approved, as well as whether to permit the applicant's proposal to use only vertically and horizontally oriented corrugated corten panels ("corrugated corten panels") on the façade articulations in between each window on the façade articulations on the end-units, i.e., 13 and 49 Ski Idlewild Road instead of blackened panel between windows, as originally designed and approved.
2. The Planning Commission shall discuss if it prefers the vertically or horizontally oriented corrugated corten panels to be utilized where it approves them.

## Staff Recommendation:

If the Planning Commission approves of the Amendment to the Single-Family Attached Design Review application for Lots 9-18, Block 5, Roam Subdivision Exemption No. 3 - 13-49 Ski Idlewild Road (PLN20-045), staff recommends the following conditions be included:

1. On all units included in this application, Applicant shall paint black paint on the blackened steel flat metal panel ("blackened panel") to match that which was approved on August 11, 2020; staff shall review.
2. Applicant shall use vertical or horizontal corrugated corten panels ("corrugated corten panels") on the façade articulations on the end-units, i.e., 13 and 49 Ski Idlewild Road, in between each vertical set of windows to match the treatment to the façade articulations as seen on the "BE Side Elevation" elevation drawings dated 07/08/2022 (attached for reference); staff shall review.

## Required Permits:

N/A. All permits (driveway and building) are already issued. SINGLE-FAMILY/TWO-FAMILY ATTACHED (DUPLEX) DESIGN REVIEW SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST

This application lists the content and format of the submittal requirements to initiate the Design Review process. An incomplete application will not be accepted. ENSURE YOU SUBMIT THIS APPLICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DESIGN REVIEW FILE NAMING CONVENTIONS. A meeting with the Planning Commission is part of the design review process.

## ABSOLUTELY NO WORK, INCLUDING TREE REMOVAL, IS TO COMMENCE ON A SITE/LOT UNTIL YOU HAVE RECEIVED APPROVAL FROM THE TOWN PLANNER.

Applications must be received by Town staff no later than two weeks prior to the Planning Commission meeting. The Commission meets on the second and fourth Tuesday of the month at 8 a.m.

Property Address \&/or Legal Description:_13 \& 49 Ski Idlewild Road, Winter Park, CO 80428
Property Owner: Ski Idlewild Property, LLC
Applicant (if other than property owner): Adam Dowling
Phone: $\quad$ 970.390.2970 Phone 2:_970.390.4208_ Email: adam@frame-built.com

Applicant's Certification Statement: I,__Adam Dowling , as Applicant and duly representative of the owner, hereby certify that the information included upon the attached Elevation, Landscape, Site, and Grading Plans are true and accurate; and that the development of the site will occur in accordance with the Plan.

| Adam Dowling Signature | 4/12/2022 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Staff Use Only |  |  |
| Approval Statement: The attached Elevation, Landscape, Site, and Grading Plans have been reviewed by the Planning Division who find that: |  |  |
| ] Design Review Fee, \$100: Check \# | Date Rec'd | Initials |
| ] Deposit Agreement, \$2,000 deposit: Check \# | Date Rec'd | Initials |
| ] Driveway Permit Deposit, \$1,000 deposit: Check \# | Date Rec'd | Initials |
| ] Driveway Permit Fee, \$50: Check \# | Date Rec'd | Initials |
| ] The Applicant is permitted to proceed to Building P ] Subject to the following conditions the Applicant is p | view. | it review |

[ ] DENIED, based upon the following reasons:

## Town Staff

## NARRATIVE FOR BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS

## PROJECT NAME:

The Row at Roam - Lots 9-18
49 \& 13 Ski Idlewild Road
Winter Park, CO 80428

OWNER, APPLICANT, PROJECT MANAGER:
Ski Idlewild Property, LLC - Adam Dowling
PO Box 632115
Littleton, CO 80163
Phone: 970.390.2970
Email: adam@therowwinterpark.com

HOMEOWNER'S ASSOCIATION:
Roam Development - Jeff Vokel
Mailing Address
City, State Zip
Phone:
Email:

## ARCHITECT:

MMM Architecture - Jenna McGregor
310 Whitewing Lane
Murphy, Texas 75094
Phone: 817.454.2384
Email: jenna@mcmarc.com

Legal Description of Site: Subd: ROAM FILING NO. 1 SUB EXEMPT NO. 3 BLOCK 5 Lot: 18 Block: 5 \& ROAM FILING NO. 1 SUB EXEMPT NO. 3 BLOCK 5
Lot: 9 Block: 5

VARIANCES GRANTED BY BoA: None

## NARRATIVE:

The requested variance is for two items; one that pertains to the metal siding at the first level of the buildings built on Lots 9 through 18 and the other request for the metal accent siding at the second level of the north exterior wall of Lot 9 and the south exterior wall of Lot 18.

The first request is for the variance of the blackened copper metal panels at the first level of the 10 buildings on Lots 9 through 18. The original plans called for 32 " tall by $60^{\prime \prime}$ long panels placed in a horizontal pattern, from corner to corner.

The metal panels that are currently in place are the same approved material (blackened copper) and installed in a horizontal mattern as originally planned, but are smaller in size, being 18" tall. These panels are also $8^{\prime}$ long in an effort to align with other vertical components of the building (i.e. gas lines, downspouts, windows).

The reduction in metal panel height is a result of the manufacture ceasing production of any panel taller than $18^{\prime \prime}$. The $18^{\prime \prime}$ tall panel was the tallest panel available from the manufacturer, so that is what was used.

The second variance request is for the metal accent siding at the north exterior wall of the second level of Lot 9 and the south exterior wall of the second level of Lot 18. The siding crew was provided the plans with the accent metal siding pattern and provided instructions on where to install each finish material, namely the rusted Corten and blackened copper metal panels. There was miscommunication with the siding crew and they installed the materials in a different configuration, that is in place now. The requested variance, if approved, would maintain the current look of what is currently in place.

## \＃\＃世華
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## Elevations submitted for Amended Design Review Application




Hugh Bell

| From: | Jenna McGregor <jenna@ mcmarc.com> |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Friday, December 10, 2021 10:38 AM |
| To: | James Shockey; Hugh Bell; Adam Dowling; Kyle Hoiland |
| Subject: | Row Elevation Option Meeting Recap |

Hugh and James,
Thank you again for your time and direction today regarding our project moving forward.
We're really on to something here, looking forward to projects ahead!
Here's a brief recap of our conversation and next step action items below:

## Agenda:

1. Discuss options for Phase I metal


Shown submitted exterior elevations
Shown updated elevations (AB Set)


Shown garage door panel photograph from factory

## Decisions:

Paint all existing "blackened copper" panels black, and end unit frame detail will be all vertical corten corrugated panel.
Test paint on 2-3 panels of an interior facing side elevation for town approval before continuing. No design review approval needed
2. Discuss Options for Phase II metal -

Option 1: Black metal to match phase I revision
Option 2: Corrugated corten siding in lieu of blackened copper on all A and B units. Removal of blackened copper all-together


Discussion of black vs corten on level 1 of phase II

## Decisions:

Jenna to provide rendering of front and rear of Phase II for black panel and corten corrugated as illustrated above for town review and approval
3. Discuss Options for Phase III elevations for larger unit

(41) FRONT ELEVATION

Show Elevations of Phase III

It was noted that Lot 1 is the only building changing on the exterior.

## Decisions:

## Design Review Required

Jenna to submit full design review application package on or before December $\mathbf{2 8}^{\text {th }}$ for the January $11^{\text {th }}$ Design Review Meeting
Include front elevation of two units next to one another in Phase III
4. Additional Items discussed

## Landscape plan was reviewed for Phase I.

Medium rocks are in front of buildings and south of building 18, please remove per landscape plan


Shown landscape plan of lot 17/18 of July 2020 submittal

Please review and let me know if anything needs to be added or modified Hugh and James.
Thanks!
Jenna McGregor, AIA, LEED AP, NCARB
Principal Architect \| Owner
McGregor • Murphy Architecture
P: 817.454.2384 | jenna@mcmarc.com

February 18, 2022

Mr. James Shockey, Town Planner<br>Town of Winter Park<br>50 Vasquez Road<br>P.O. Box 3327<br>Winter Park, Colorado 80482

## Re: Roam ROW Project Single Family Attached Design Review Application

Dear James,
The Roam Design Review committee has reviewed the amended exterior elevations that are proposed for the The ROW units located on lots $9-18$. It is our understanding the panels originally proposed are no longer being manufactured and therefore are being substituted with panels that are $8^{\prime}$ long and $18^{\prime \prime}$ tall. This panel is also being applied to the accent metal on the second level of lots 9 and 18 .

Given the material will provide the same exterior appearance, the Roam Design Review Committee approves this modification and authorizes that the Ski Idlewild, LLC to proceed with this amendment with the Town of Winter Park.

Please review and call with questions or comments.
Sincerely,
Roam Design Review Committee
Jeffrey Vogel, AICP
Chair

## MEMO

TO Planning Commission<br>FROM<br>THROUGH<br>DATE<br>RE<br>TJ Dlubac, CPS, Contracted Planner<br>James Shockey, Community Development Director<br>April 26, 2022<br>Minor Subdivision - Replat of Tract F, River Walk at Winter Park Filing No. 1 and unplatted property known as Idlewild Subdivision Exemption No. 1 (PLN22-024)

Applicant: Natalie Satt, Highland Development Company on behalf of Tom Tenenbaum, Idlewild LLC and Zachary Nassar, manager of Riverwalk, LLC.

Zoning: Planned Development (Residential-Commercial Service District R-C) and Multi-family Residential (Multiple-Family Residential District R-2)

## Background:

The Idlewild Subdivision Exemption No. 1 property ("Idlewild Property") was annexed into the Town of Winter Park in 2007 and simultaneously zoned Planned Development with an underlying zoning designation of Residential-Commercial Service District (R-C) per the Annexation and Zoning Plan.

The River Walk at Winter Park property ("River Walk Property") was platted in March 2000 and is zoned R-2 Multi-Family Residential. The majority of the property platted was dedicated to the town for parks and roadways with the remainder of the land held for future development. This request only impacts Tract F which was, per Note 6 of the Final Plat, for future development.

## Project Overview:

The owners of each the Idlewild Property and River Walk Property were designing their respective properties when they both agreed that a land swap would benefit the overall development of the area. To move forward with the land swap, a minor subdivision is required to allow the change in ownership of the parcels. The land swap will allow better access and better design along the Ski Idlewild corridor. A preliminary plat for the Sojourn property accompanies this minor subdivision request. The River Walk property owner recently received Sketch Plan approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission February 8, 2022. The anticipated land swap has already been incorporated into each development's design.

The request is to swap 62,844 square feet of Idlewild Property to be combined with River Walk Property in exchange for 59,599 square feet being removed from River Walk Property and combined with Idlewild Property. Please see the figure below identifying the parcels which are being swapped.


The two properties propose residential development comprised of single-family detached units, single-family attached units, and multi-family units. A condition of approval and a plat note will restrict the issuance of any building permits until the respective property has received preliminary plat and final plat approval from the Town. This restriction will provide assurance that the land swap is completed, that the preliminary plats are in conformance with ownership and zoning, and that the newly created lots are incorporated into an overall development plan of each of the newly established parcels.

## Access:

Access to both properties is from Ski Idlewild Road. By virtue of the land swap, access spacing can be met along Ski Idlewild. Additional access, traffic, and internal circulation items will be addressed with the preliminary plats submitted for each individual project.

## Review Agency Comments:

The Minor Subdivision was referred to the Town of Winter Park Engineering and Community Development Departments for review. No comments were received.

## Public Comments:

Staff sent notice to adjacent property owners on April 18, 2022. As of the drafting of this staff report, no comments have been received.

## Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the Replat of Tract F, River Walk at Winter Park Filing No. 1 and unplatted property known as Idlewild Subdivision Exemption No. 1 Minor Subdivision plat subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant shall provide an updated, final minor subdivision plat addressing all redlines provided by Town Staff prior to recordation of the plat with the Grand County Clerk and Recorder.
2. The Plat shall not be recorded until the properties are rezoned in accordance with Town Code § 7-10-1.

| TOWN OF WINTER PARK Townoforer P.O. Box $3327 \cdot 50$ Vasquez Road $\cdot$ Winter Park, co 80482 Phone: $970-726-8081 \cdot$ Fax: $970-726-8084$ Website: www.wpgov.com LAND USE REVIEW APPLICATION FORM <br> TOWN OF WINTER PARK <br> P.O. Box 3327 • 50 Vasquez Road • Winter Park, CO 80482 <br> Phone: 970-726-8081 • Fax: 970-726-8084 <br> Website: www.wpgov.com <br> LAND USE REVIEW APPLICATION FORM |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROJECT INFORMATION |  |  |  |  |  |
| Project Name: Sojourn at Idlewild |  |  |  | Date: April 7, 2022 |  |
| Street Address (or general location if not addressed): 398 Ski Idlewild Rd. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Schedule Number(s) or Parcel Number(s): 158728400034 and 158728400035 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Area (in square feet or acres): 19.154 acres ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Existing Zoning: P-D (R-C) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existing Land Use: Vacant |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legal Description: ALL 12.5 AC +/- SW4SE4 OF SEC 28 T1S R75W BEING THAT PART |  |  |  |  |  |
| LYING NORTH OF ROAD |  |  |  |  |  |
| OWNER / APPLICANT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Name: Tom Tenenbaum |  |  |  | Phone: 303-919-1300 |  |
| Company: Idlewild LLC |  |  |  | Email: att@tlawfirm.com |  |
| Mailing Address: 10325 Bristleridge Ct |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parker, CO 80134 |  |  |  |  |  |
| CONTACT PERSON |  |  |  |  |  |
| Name: Natalie Satt |  |  |  | Phone: 720-739-7200 |  |
| Company: Highland Development Company |  |  |  | Email: nsatt@highlanddevelopmentco.com |  |
| Mailing Address: 2100 Downing St. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Denver, CO 80205 |  |  |  |  |  |
| TYPE OF APPLICATION (check all that apply) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Subdivision | Fee |  | Other Development | Fee |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
|  | Sketch Plan | \$250.00 |  | Zoning Variance | \$250.00 |
|  | Preliminary Plat | \$500.00* |  | Special Use Permit | \$150.00 |
|  | Final Plat | \$750.00* |  | Rezoning Request | \$350.00 |
|  | Amended Final Plat | \$375.00* |  | Subdivision Exemption | \$300.00 |
|  | As-Built Plat | \$250.00 |  | Amended Exemption | \$150.00 |
|  | Amended As-Built Plat | \$250.00* |  | Annexation | \$500.00*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | *Number of Lots: | x \$10.00 |  | *Number of Lots: | x \$10.00 |
|  | TOTAL FEES: | \$ |  | TOTAL FEES: | \$ 300.00 |
|  | Minor Subdivision | Fee |  | Planned Development | Fee |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| X | Final Plat | \$400.00* |  | Preapplication Conference | No Fee |
|  | Amended Minor Sub. | \$200.00 |  | Preliminary Development Plan | \$1,000.00** |
|  |  |  |  | Final Development Plan | \$1,000.00** |
|  |  |  |  | Amended Final Plan | \$500.00** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | * /***Number of Lots: | x \$10.00 |  | **Number of Lots: | x \$2.00 |
|  | TOTAL FEES: | \$ |  | TOTAL FEES: | \$ |
| * In addition to the base fee, an additional $\$ 10.00$ per unit or lot$* * *$ In addition to the base fee, an additional $\$ 10.00$ per acre |  |  | Tn addition to the base fee, an additional S2.00 pere unitor or |  |  |
| In addition to the base fees the applicant is required to pay the cost of any legal notices and adjoining property owner certified mailings. The applicant may also be subject to reimbursement fees as outlined within Section 7-10-8 of the Town Code. |  |  |  |  |  |

## BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

This minor subdivision application replaces the March 21, 2022 exemption plat application for Sojourn at Idlewild. Supporting documentation can be found with the previous application or with the Preliminary Plat application.


Signature of Owner

Signature of Representative

## Date

April 7, 2022
Date

Acceptance of this application and required filing fee does not constitute a complete application. Plans and other material required to constitute a complete application are listed in the application procedure.

STAFF USE ONLY (do not write below this line)

## Application Received By:

| Case \# | Date / Time: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Fees: $\$$ | Date Paid: | Check \# |
| Additional Comments: |  |  |

Additional Comments:

April 12, 2022

James Shockey
Community Development Director
Town of Winter Park
50 Vasquez Rd.
Winter Park, CO 80482

## DearJames,

As the contracted buyers of the Idlewild parcel (398 Ski Idlewild Rd., Parcel ID: 158728400034, currently owned by Idlewild, LLC), Highland Development Company requests an minor subdivision to adjust the property lot lines between this parcel and the Riverwalk parcel (Parcel ID: 158728403003, currently owned by Riverwalk LLC). We have reached an agreement to transfer 62,844 square feet of the Idlewild property to Riverwalk, and 59,599 square feet of the Riverwalk property to Idlewild.

In accordance with section 8-1-4-A-2 of the Town Code of Winter Park, this minor subdivision will create no more than the recorded number of parcels, does not increase any existing nonconformities, and will comply with existing zoning requirements. Further, the property transferred to the Idlewild parcel will shift to the P-D zoning granted in the Annexation and Vested Rights Development Agreement effective August 21, 2007 (Reception \#: 2007012396). The property transferred to Riverwalk will revert to the underlying R-Czoning.

Sincerely,

Natalie Satt
Development Associate

## REPLAT OF TRACT F, RIVER WALK AT WINTER PARK FILING NO, 1 - EXEMPTION PLAT

## A PART OF THE SOUTHWEST QUARTER OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 75 WEST

 OF THE SIXTH PRINCIPAL MERIDIAN, TOWN OF WINTER PARK, COUNTY OF GRAND, STATE OF COLORADO


## MEMO

| TO | Planning Commission |
| :--- | :--- |
| FROM | TJ Dlubac, CPS, Contracted Planner |
| THROUGH | James Shockey, Community Development Director |
| DATE | April 26, 2022 |
| RE | Preliminary Plat - Sojourn at Idlewild (PLN21-127) |

Applicant: Natalie Satt of Highland Development Company on behalf of Tom Tenenbaum, Idlewild LLC

Zoning: P-D (Planned Development) with R-C (Residential Commercial) underlay

## Background:

The property, consisting of 22.005 acres, was annexed into the Town in 2007 (Reception No. 2007012395) and at that time referred to as the "Idlewild Property." The property was proposed for a mixed-use development as exhibited on the Annexation and Zoning Plan ("AZP") and zoned P-D (Planned Development) upon annexation with an underlying zoning designation of R-C (Residential Commercial). The primary uses for the property were single family, multi-family, and commercial.

The annexation approval included an Annexation and Vested Rights Development Agreement ("Agreement") (Reception No. 2007012396). The Agreement requires the developer to construct portions of River Road (termed in the Agreement as "Arrowhead Parkway"). The Agreement allows the developer to create an improvement district and an application has been submitted to the Town for this purpose. Provisions for cost sharing and recapture for off-site, joint improvements such as roadways, oversized water and sewer lines, and improvements to the Fraser River crossing were also included in the Agreement.

Dedication of private open space, park land, and trails as identified on the AZP were outlined in the Agreement. See "Parks, Trails, and Open Space" below for further detail. The Agreement and AZP required one (1) acre of park land dedication, dedication of private open space, and dedication of a ten-foot (10')-wide pedestrian and equestrian trail as shown on the AZP.

The vesting period for the Agreement is fifteen (15) years beginning on the date of execution of the Agreement. The Agreement requires final subdivision platting of the entire property by 2032, or else the Town's approval for all unplatted portions shall lapse.

The AZP allows a maximum of 389 total residential units comprised of 319 dwelling units (DU) and 70 accommodation units (AU). An AU is defined as "Any room or group of rooms without cooking facilities designed for or adapted for occupancy by guests and accessible from common corridors, walks, or balconies without passing through another accommodation unit or dwelling."

The AZP also includes a definition for condominium hotel, which it defines as "Any room or group of rooms with cooking facilities designed for adapted to occupancy by guests and accessible from common corridors, walks, or balconies without passing through another room or unit." The maximum number of condominium hotel units is twenty (20) units per acre. When calculating maximum
densities and allowed units, condominium hotel units are considered AU. The Application uses the term "lock-offs," but this is not a permitted use or a defined term in the Town Code.

## Anticipated Land Swap:

The Applicant has been in discussions with the owner to the west of Tract F, River Walk at Winter Park Subdivision, Filing 1 (Reception No. 2000002589) to swap two (2) parcels of land within their respective properties to facilitate better designs for each project. The land swap will allow better access and residential layouts along the Ski Idlewild Road corridor. A minor subdivision plat has been submitted to the Town for review and future public hearings by the Planning Commission and Town Council. The anticipated land swap has been incorporated into this preliminary plat.

Should the proposed land swap move forward and the minor subdivision plat be approved, the Applicant shall amend the Agreement and to submit a rezoning application. Once the amendment to the Agreement is approved, which will be processed as a FDP amendment, the final plat for Sojourn at Idlewild may be scheduled for hearings with the Planning Commission and Town Council. The minor subdivision plat, amended Idlewild FDP, and the Sojourn at Idlewild final plat must be recorded with the County Clerk and Recorder in this specified order.

## Project Overview:

The subject property is vacant except for a tennis court and is located on the north and south sides of Ski Idlewild Road, abutting the municipal boundaries of Fraser on the north and abutting Rendezvous Filing No. 1 to the east. The 19.925-acres proposed for residential uses are proposed for two (2) single-family detached (SFD) dwelling units (DU), twenty-two (22) single-family attached (SFA) DU, 110 townhome or "rowhome" (SFA) DU, and two (2) apartment buildings comprised of 82 condominiumized, multifamily (MF) DU across both buildings. A 4,800 sq. ft. community center is proposed in one of the apartment buildings.

## Civil Drawings:

Civil drawings were submitted with the application and are available HERE.

## Density and Unit Types:

Per the AZP the maximum number of residential units allowed is 389 units consisting of 319 dwelling units (DU) and 70 accommodation units (AU). This application does not and cannot consider modifications to the density permitted in the AZP. Rather this application must ensure compliance with the density approved in the AZP.

216 residential units are proposed. The Applicant is considering adding 64 additional DU within the downhill row homes, which would require condominiumization via the As-Built Plat process, amounting to 280 DU total. The overall density is 12.7 DU/acre ( 280 DU / 22.005 acres) which is below the 17 DU/acre allowed by the AZP. The mix of units and average lot sizes includes:

- One-car garage row home (Single Family Attached; SFA): 78 DU/lots with average lot size of $1,394 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.
- Two-car garage row home: 32 DU/lots with average lot size of $2,142 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.
- Two apartment buildings: 82 DU with average lot size of $75,080 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.
- Duplex/Paired Homes: 22 DU/lots with average lot size of 3,070 sq. ft.
- Single-family detached home: 2 DU/lots with average lot size of $8,283 \mathrm{sq}$. ft.

The developer is still considering if the additional 64 DU will contain kitchens. If the units are built without a kitchen, they will be reclassified as $A U$ and the units will not be required to be condominiumized.

The application was reviewed and analyzed under all possible circumstances and the proposal complies with the densities and unit counts allowed by the AZP.

## Setbacks, Building Coverage, and Dimensional Standards:

Satisfactory. The property is subject to the building setback requirements dictated on the AZP. Setbacks for rowhomes (SFA) are measured from the overall property lines and not from individual lot lines.

The AZP allows 50\% building coverage for DU lots and $75 \%$ for $A U$. The plat meets this requirement. This building coverage calculation is made using the 19.925-acre portion of the property (See table on Sheet 2 of the plat). Overall, $18.35 \%$ of the property is comprised of building footprints.

The development standards per the approved AZP are:

|  | Units per <br> Gross <br> Acre | Min. Lot <br>  <br> Min. Depth | Min. <br> Front <br> Width | Setbacks <br> (Distance from overall <br> property lines) |  |  |  | Max. <br> Height | Max. <br> B/dg. <br> Coverage |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Front | Rear | Side | Corner |  |  |
| SFD DU | 20 | n/a | $50^{\prime}$ | $25^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $35^{\prime}$ | $50 \%$ |
| SFA DU | 20 | n/a | n/a | $25^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $35^{\prime}$ | $50 \%$ |
| MF DU | 20 | n/a | n/a | $25^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $35^{\prime}$ | $50 \%$ |
| AU | 20 | n/a | n/a | $25^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $50^{\prime}$ | $75 \%$ |
| Non-Res | n/a | n/a | $50^{\prime}$ | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | $50^{\prime}$ | n/a |
| Open Space | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |

## Parking:

Partially satisfactory. The Applicant hasn't concluded if the additional 64 units will be DU or AU. Each single-family attached and detached DU will have garage and driveway off-street parking. The apartment buildings will have both covered and uncovered off-street parking. At least 362 off-street parking spaces are required and 573 are provided. Additional spaces for guest parking are provided. Any proposed on-street parking will ultimately be determined by roadway design and pavement widths.

| Off-Street Parking Requirements |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Use | Standard | \# DU/\# Bedrooms (br)/Sq. Ft. | Parking Required | Parking Provided |
| Apartment Building \#1 (MF) | 1 space per 1 br 1.5 spaces per 2 br 2 spaces per 3+br | $\begin{aligned} & 11-1 \mathrm{br} \\ & 27-2 \mathrm{br} \\ & 2-3+b r \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & 41 \\ & 4 \\ & \text { Total } 56 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 68 |
| Apartment Building \#2 (MF) | 1 space per 1br 1.5 spaces per 2br 2 spaces per 3+br | $\begin{aligned} & 3-1 \mathrm{br} \\ & 32-2 \mathrm{br} \\ & 7-3+\mathrm{br} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 3 \\ & 48 \\ & 14 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 65 |


|  |  |  | Total 65 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SFA <br> (townhome/duplex) | 1 space per 1br <br> 1.5 spaces per 2br <br> 2 spaces per 3+br | $78-2 \mathrm{br}$ <br> $32-3+\mathrm{br}$ <br> $22-3+\mathrm{br}$ <br> (paired) | 17 <br> 64 <br> 44 <br> Total 125 |  |
| SFD | 2 spaces per DU | 2 units | 4 | 308 |
| Additional 64 DU or <br> AU | 1 space per DU <br> (Assuming 1br) | $64-1 \mathrm{br}$ | 64 | 8 |
| Additional Parking <br> (community center) | 1 space per 100 sq.ft <br> (Assuming most <br> restrictive parking <br> calculation) | 4800 sq ft | 48 | 64 |
|  |  | Total DU: 216 <br> Additional 64 <br> DU or AU: 64 <br> Overall Total: <br> 280 | 362 | 60 |

## Access:

Access to the SFD and SFA DU will be from three (3) internal private roads connecting to Ski Idlewild Road. Six (6) DU will gain access from a shared private driveway connecting to Porphyry Pass Road. Each SFD and SFA DU will have direct access to a private roadway and/or driveway.

Concerns have been expressed by the Town, CDOT and the East Grand Fire Protection District (EGFPD) regarding the roadway design and/or impacts to off-site roadways and intersections. The Applicant has met with EGFPD and resolved dead-end roadways. Applicant will resolve remaining outstanding issues including concerns about additional pavement width on certain internal roadways.

CDOT has requested that the Traffic Impact Study be modified to include impacts from approved developments in the area, in addition to those existing, to ensure traffic is accounted for on intersections with Highway 40. There will likely be improvements required to off-site intersections on Highway 40 that are triggered by the existing, proposed, and approved developments in the area. The concern is that the impact from all development may trigger improvement so off-site intersections with Highway 40. An updated Traffic Impact Study will be required at time of final plat submittal to analyze this issue.

One other access issue that must be addressed at time of final plat application submittal is providing continued legal access to the existing single-family dwelling located to the northwest of the property ( 375 Ski Idlewild Road). There is an existing access easement in place; however, the developer proposes vacating this easement and replacing it with an internal roadway. The existing easement must be vacated by separate instrument and new easement dedicated on the final plat. Access to the lot must also not be impeded by improvements such as landscaping or curb and the single-family lot owner must be party to and in agreement with the terms of the new easement.

## Parks, Trails and Open Space:

The Agreement requires a total of one (1) acre of park land dedication and dedication of trails. The AZP identifies a 7,237 sq. ft. park on the east side of the property, which has been dedicated to the Town. The plat shows 202,637 square feet ( 4.65 acres) of additional park land (Outlot $G$ ) that will be
dedicated and deeded to the Town at the time of final plat, thereby satisfying the Agreement's dedication requirement.

There are also trails identified on the AZP and in the Agreement that are to be dedicated to the Town. Two trails are required to be ten feet (10') wide and built for pedestrian and equestrian use. The first lies along the northern boundary of the property and the second along and over the bridge connecting to the Fraser River Trail. The Agreement requires the trails to be conveyed as an easement or in fee with construction and maintenance of the trails being the responsibility of the developer. Both trails have been placed into tracts that will be dedicated to the Town and connect to existing public trails within the Town's trail system.

The Agreement exceeds the Town's requirements for public open space within the property and therefore no additional open space dedication or payment in lieu is required.

## Landscaping and Revegetation:

Unsatisfactory. The Applicant will be updating the landscaping plan to match the final plat. The property is subject to Land Use Transition Zone (LTZ) requirements. Applicant shall indicate if any fencing is proposed.

## Erosion Control / Drainage Plan / Drainage Report:

Applicant submitted a variance request to deviate from the Standards and Specifications for Design and Construction, Section 6.2.5(X), Drainage Policy - Stormwater Detention, which reads: "The policy of the Town shall be to require on-site detention facilities for all development, expansion and redevelopment, unless a variance is granted..." Applicant states that due to the proposed land swap, stormwater will drain through Tract F, River Walk Subdivision and the two developments will work on a cohesive design. They propose a shared stormwater quality treatment vault and development flows will be directed to the Fraser River.

## Snow Storage:

Partially satisfactory. The Standards (Section 3.11) require snow storage areas to comprise a minimum of $25 \%$ of all driving surfaces, gravel shoulders, parking areas, and pedestrian walkways. The Standards also dictate that snow storage shall not be shown within 3 ' of all surface utilities.

The plat identifies snow storage easements and the landscaping plan identifies snow storage areas. Snow storage easements are adjacent to both sides of most roadways. Snow storage is proposed to abut a jurisdictional wetland. A condition of approval for the final plat, and a note on the final plat, will require the Applicant to ensure wetland protection from damage and contamination incurred by storing snow. This protection must be specifically demonstrated and identified on the civil drawings and landscaping plans. Protection methods could include berms and fencing.

56,000 sq. ft. of snow storage are proposed; at least $46,375 \mathrm{sq}$. ft. are required (185,500 sq. ft. hardscaped surfaces x 0.25).

## School Impact Fee:

This project is subject to school impact fees since no land dedication has been proposed. The fee and the fee in lieu of land dedication collected shall be equivalent to the market value of land area for the total number of dwelling units.

The amount is calculated as follows: $\$ 1,586$ per DU $\times 216 \mathrm{DU}=\$ 342,576.00$

## HOA / Declaration of Covenants:

Partially satisfactory. The developer has noted that an HOA will govern the apartment buildings and the proposed metro district will oversee the SFD and SFA portions of the subdivision. No draft of the Declaration of Covenants has been submitted this item will be deferred to the final plat submission. The Applicant has an approved service plan for the metro district (Resolution 1955, Series 2022).

## Development Improvements Agreement (DIA):

All improvements (water, sewer, roadway, landscaping, drainage/erosion control, etc.) associated with the proposed project are required to be guaranteed (120\%) through a DIA. The DIA shall be approved prior to site disturbance. An Engineers' Estimate of Probable Cost (EEOPC) was submitted.

## Wetlands:

Wetlands comprise a large portion of the west and southwestern portions of the property (4.1 acres), primarily adjacent to the Fraser River. The jurisdictional wetlands will be dedicated to the Town. A portion of the jurisdictional wetland located on the south side of Ski Idlewild Road will be disturbed for construction of River Road that will extend south to future development and offer access to one of the apartment buildings. A permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers is required to discharge fill materials into jurisdictional wetlands. The apartment lot, roadways, several SFA DU, and developable portions of Tract F, River Walk Subdivision Filing 1 will encroach into two (2) nonjurisdictional wetlands on the north side of Ski Idlewild Road. The square footage of impacted wetlands is unclear. The Planning Commission, Town Council, and Town Engineer must approve all wetland encroachments per § 7-3-8 of Town Code.

See "Snow Storage" above for details about requirements for snow storage areas adjacent to wetlands.

## Plat:

Staff is redlining the plat and will present this to the Applicant after the Planning Commission hearing.

## Review Agency Comments (Link to comment letters):

- CDOT

Brian Killian, Region 3 Access Program Manager, responded to the referral in an email dated November 29, 2021 and in an email dated February 23, 2022. In his latter email he stated that CDOT does not believe the estimate of $80 \%$ recreational homes is realistic and that a higher number of primary residences would generate more traffic at the junction of Rendezvous Way and Highway 40. They requested an updated Traffic Impact Study. See attached emails for details.

- Colorado Geological Survey

Amy Crandall, Engineering Geologist, responded to the referral in a letter dated December 6, 2021. In the letter she recommended the Town require a geological hazard assessment discussing the risks associated with landslides and slope instability. She also expressed concerns about groundwater levels, subsurface drainage, and other concerns. See attached letter for details.

The Applicant met with CGS and detailed in an email to the Town that CGS was agreeable to moving forward with portions of the development prior to resubmittal of the requested slope stability analysis. The Town requested this response in writing from CGS but has not yet received
the letter. A condition of approval has been added to this plat.

- Colorado Parks and Wildlife

Jeromy Huntington, Area Wildlife Manager, responded to the referral in a letter dated December 9, 2021. In that letter he detailed issues and recommendations relating to wetland and riparian habitat along Fraser River. There were also standard recommendations regarding human-wildlife conflicts, protection for avian species, containment of non-native plants and weeds, and interference with natural habitats caused by increasing density, fencing, lighting, and noise. See attached letter for details.

- East Grand Fire Protection District No. 4

Dennis Soles, Fire Marshal, responded to the referral in a letter dated November 30, 2021 and in a letter dated February 22, 2022. In the latter letter EGFPD requested additional road width. The roads proposed are 24 feet with no shoulder and the IFC D102 requires roads with hydrants to be a minimum of 26 feet. See attached letters for details.

The Applicant has met with EGFPD and will continue to work with them on the final roadway design.

- East Grand School District

Frank Reeves, Superintendent, responded to the referral in an email dated November 2, 2021. In that email he stated the District requests money in lieu of land dedication for the development. See attached email for details.

- Grand County Water and Sanitation District (GCWSD)

Cooper Karsh, Project Manager for JVA Consulting Engineers and contracted engineer for GCWSD, responded in a letter dated December 17, 2021 and a letter dated February 25, 2022. In the letter, GCWSD expressed concern with the second water main connection across from Fraser River and with the downstream 8" sanitary sewer, including the inverted siphon under the Fraser River. There was also discussion regarding necessary joint, off-site improvements. See attached letters for details.

- Mountain Parks Electric

Jean Johnston, Senior Staking Engineer / R.O.W. Specialist, responded to the referral in an email dated December 2, 2021 and a second email dated February 23, 2022. In the email she expressed concern about minimum separation requirements and existing equipment and easements. See attached emails for details.

- Town Engineer

Cooper Karsh, P.E., CFM, Project Manager for JVA Consulting Engineers, responded to the referral in a letter dated December 17, 2021 and in a letter dated February 25, 2022. In the letters he agreed with the delay of the slope stability study until final plat application submittal. He also recommended that all CDOT concerns be addressed with any final plat submittal including the submission of a new Traffic Impact Study. He also stated he agrees with the letter from the USACE that less than 0.1 acre of jurisdictional wetland will be disturbed. He recommends the Applicant provide letters for neighboring properties that easements are being coordinated. See attached letters for details.

- Town Transit Division (The Lift)

The Transit Division is reviewing options for a bus stop.

- US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)

Travis Morse, Senior Project Manager for the Northwestern Colorado Branch, responded to the referral in an email dated November 26, 2021. In this email he questioned the phasing of the development and how the development would be designing activity to minimize adverse effects to US waters. There was concern regarding protection from road salt, sand, litter, oil and other pollutants in the snow storage areas. See attached email for details.

- Xcel

Kathleen Jacoby, Design Planner, responded to the referral in a letter dated December 8, 2021 and in an email dated February 9, 2022. In the letters she noted that acceptable easement language will be required on the final plat and that reinforcement may be needed for the existing system. This reinforcement will be the Applicant's responsibility. See attached letter and email for details.

Letters were sent to the following agencies but responses were not received prior to the deadline:

- Comcast
- Denver Water\#
- Headwaters Trails Alliance\#
- Grand County Assessor
- Grand County Planning Department
- Lumen\#
- Town Public Works Department\#

If the Commission feels comments from any of the above listed agencies are necessary, the Applicant would be responsible for obtaining those letters prior to final plat review.

## Public Comments:

Staff sent notice to adjacent property owners on March 30, 2022. One (1) comment has been received as of April 21.

- Paula Stuart (114 Lookout Point): Ms. Stuart's concerns were associated with viewshed, building height, setbacks, water quality, density, and seasonal flooding in the river corridor. See attached letter for details.


## Miscellaneous items to be resolved at time of recordation of the Final Plat:

1. A Certificate of Taxes, shown to be paid in full, from the County Treasurer.
2. A Statement of Authority.
3. If there is a lien holder, a ratification and confirmation of the plat.
4. A School Impact Fee in the amount of $\$ 342,576.00$
5. A digital file of the approved plat. The digital file shall be in a format acceptable to the Town's system. Requirements for digital submittal can be obtained from the Town's Planning Division.
6. A 11 "x 17 " 911 Address Plat.
7. An executed final plat mylar and other supporting documents.

## Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends approval of the Sojourn at Idlewild preliminary plat and the elimination of existing jurisdictional and non-jurisdictional wetlands as identified on the preliminary plat, subject to the following conditions to be met prior to final plat submittal:

1. Town approval of any jurisdictional wetland encroachment is conditioned upon approval of the encroachment by the US Army Corps of Engineers and the Town Engineer pursuant to § 7-3-8 of Town Code.
2. All trails shall be conveyed as an easement or in fee to the Town with construction of the trails being the responsibility of the developer. Applicant shall indicate how trail access will be maintained along the north property line during construction.
3. Applicant shall indicate if fencing is proposed.
4. Applicant shall provide an updated preliminary plat per the redlined version provided by Town Staff.
5. Applicant shall provide a written response from Colorado Geological Survey stating the requirements of the preliminary plat and the delay of the Slope Stability Report are acceptable.
6. The Town Engineer shall review the administrative variance request regarding on-site retention facilities pursuant to Section 6.2.5 X, Drainage Policy - Stormwater Detention of the Standards and Specifications for Design and Construction.
7. The following items were not submitted with the preliminary plat and shall be submitted with the final plat application:
a. Letter of Evidence from Attorney
b. Memorandum of Understanding between the owners of Sojourn at Idlewild and Tract F, River Walk Subdivision, for offsite improvements including but not limited to stormwater, drainage, etc.
c. Complete Slope Stability Report addressing concerns and criteria from Colorado Geological Survey and the Town.
d. Traffic Impact Study incorporating approved developments into impact analysis addressing concerns from CDOT and the Town, including impacts to Ski Idlewild Road, Rendezvous Way, and Highway 40 intersections.
8. The final plat shall include the following plat note: "Prior to issuance of building permits for Lots 135 and 138, a site-specific geological slope stability analysis will be required."
9. The Sojourn at Idlewild minor subdivision plat (PLN22-024) is approved by the Town.
10. Applicant shall demonstrate the wetlands adjacent to snow storage areas will be protected from contamination and damage in the final landscaping plans and civil drawings.
11. The final plat shall include the following plat note: "Wetlands adjacent to snow storage areas shall be protected from damage."
12. Applicant shall indicate the square footage of wetlands to be impacted.
13. Applicant shall address to CDOT's satisfaction all comments made by CDOT in the email dated February 23, 2022.
14. Applicant shall address to Colorado Geological Survey's satisfaction all comments made by Colorado Geological Survey in the letter dated December 6, 2021.
15. Applicant shall address to East Grand Fire Protection District No. 4's satisfaction all comments made by East Grand Fire Protection District No. 4 in the letter dated February 22, 2022.
16. Applicant shall address to the Town Engineer's satisfaction all comments made by the Town Engineer in the letter dated February 25, 2022.
17. Applicant shall address to Grand County Water and Sanitation District No. 1's satisfaction all comments made in Grand County Water and Sanitation District No. 1's letter dated February 25, 2022.
18. Applicant shall address to Mountain Parks Electric's satisfaction all comments made in Mountain Parks Electric's letter dated February 23, 2022.
19. Applicant shall address to Xcel Energy's satisfaction all comments made in Xcel Energy's letter dated February 9, 2022.
20. Applicant shall address to the Community Development Department's satisfaction all comments made by Community Planning Strategies dated March 3, 2022.


## BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT



| $\overline{\text { Signature of Owner }}$ | Date <br> Signature of Representative |
| :--- | :--- |
| October 18, 2021 |  |

Acceptance of this application and required filing fee does not constitute a complete application. Plans and other material required to constitute a complete application are listed in the application procedure.

STAFF USE ONLY (do not write below this line)

## Application Received By:

| Case \# | Date / Time: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Total Fees: $\$$ | Date Paid: | Check \# |
| Addili |  |  |

Additional Comments:

Date:
October 19, 2021
REVISED January 28, 2022
(revised text shown in blue)

To: $\quad$| Town of Winter Park |
| :--- |
|  |
|  |
| Community Development Department |
| C/o James Shockey |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  | W.O.Box 3327 Park, CO 80482

Via E-Mail: James Shockey (ishockey@wpgov.com)
CC: $\quad$ Natalie Satt \& Paul Malone, Highland Development Company, LLC Thomas Tenenbaum, Idlewild, LLC

## Re: Preliminary Plat Submittal, Sojourn at Idlewild

Dear James:
Attached to this written description is our Preliminary Plat submittal for Idlewild on behalf of Idlewild, LLC and Highland Development Company, LLC. This residential project will provide diverse housing types within close proximity to downtown Winter Park, allowing homeowners to walk or bike to downtown.

This parcel has an existing annexation agreement with the Town of Winter Park. This Preliminary Plat submittal is based on this approved annexation agreement. However, we are proposing fee simple lots at duplex and row home units. With this lot arrangement lot lines will be located centered on party walls between units. Therefore, some of the items noted in the annexation agreement while still applying to the overall site layout and individual buildings may not apply to individual lots at individual units. These items include setbacks to side yard lot lines and maximum building coverage calculations. However, based on follow-up discussions with Town staff setbacks, building coverage, etc. shall be based on the overall site. Therefore, we are compliant with the annexation agreement and Town Code.

We are proposing small lock off units within this development. The Annexation agreement allows for 319 residential units plus 70 accommodation units. We want our lock off units to provide much needed work force housing. We do not consider these to be accommodation units as defined in the annexation agreement. While these units would be very similar to accommodation units we want to be able to install small kitchens in these lock off units. Therefore, we don't want the accommodation unit definition to apply in this case. However, even if we add lock off units to our overall unit count we are well under the unit count permitted by the annexation agreement.

Trail connections are being provided through our site to connect to our neighbors and beyond. It is our intention to have the walkways and roadways on this site be private. A metropolitan district will be formed to own and maintain the private streets, sidewalks, trails, landscaping, and community center. We have been in communication with owners of adjacent parcels. This ongoing coordination effort is to provide a cohesive site design with coordinated trail and roadway connections as well as integrated grading, drainage, and utilities.

We are coordination with the neighboring property owners to the west to swap land. This land swap will create a better layout for both projects. This will benefit the residents of these two projects as well as the overall community with better trail and roadway connectivity.

## PARCEL DESCRIPTION:

See Dedication on Preliminary Plat.


AERIAL PHOTO

## HISTORY

The land for this project was originally part of the base area for Idlewild ski area. There is an existing tennis court north of Ski Idlewild Road that will be removed. The wheeler property to the north accesses their site through a ROW easement north of Ski Idlewild Road.

## RELEVANT SITE CHARACTERISTICS\SITE TOPOGRAPHY

Please see the aerial photo above as well as attached grading plans as prepared by the Civil engineer for reference. The site generally slopes from east to west, with the upper areas being hillside trees, and the lower areas being meadow grass.

## CREEKS\WETLANDS

The Fraser River runs south to north west of the property. The majority of the developable area of this property is unaffected by floodplains or wetlands. There is a shallow pond on the south side of Ski Idlewild Road, with significant surrounding jurisdictional wetland areas. All wet areas north of the road have been determined to be non-jurisdictional. These non-jurisdictional wetlands will be removed as part of this
project and we are impacting less than $1 / 10^{\text {th }}$ of an acre of jurisdictional wetlands thus staying under the threshold requiring Army Corp of Engineers review and approval.

## GEOLOGY/SOILS

Please read the attached soils report by A.G. Wassenaar, Inc. Dated 9-20-2021. There appears to be no impediment to safe development on this site.

## VEGETATION

The site is undeveloped, except for Ski Idlewild Road bisecting the site. The meadows are grass and wetlands. The hillside areas are currently treed. Vegetative cover is $+/-75 \%$. Please see the attached landscape plan for proposed landscaping.

## POTENTIAL RADIATION HAZARD

There are no known radiation hazards in this area.

## SNOW STORAGE

Paved areas requiring snow storage equal approximately $185,500 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. Snow storage is required totaling at least $25 \%$ of this area or $46,375 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. Snow storage areas shown $=$ approximately $56,000 \mathrm{Sq}$. Ft. or $30 \%$ of paved areas. Therefore, an adequate amount of snow storage is being provided on site.

## ZONING

The existing zoning is RC. Please refer to the attached approved Idlewild Annexation and Zoning Plan for zoning and site data for this site.

## REQUESTED EXCEPTIONS

No zoning exemptions are being requested at this time.

## PROPOSED PRELIMINARY PLAT

A. DENSITY: Slightly over 13 Dwelling units per acre currently being proposed. (17 units per acre permitted. Refer to the attached approved Idlewild Annexation and Zoning Plan.)
B. ARCHITECTURE: Building design is being determined at this time.
C. AVERAGE UNIT SIZE (not incl. garage areas):

1 bedroom units +/-800 SF
2 bedroom units $+/-1,000 \mathrm{SF}$ to $+/-1,800 \mathrm{SF}$
3 or more bedroom units $+/-1,500$ SF to $+/-2,750$ SF
D. TOTAL BUILDING FOOTPRINT $=+/-160,750$ SF
E. TOTAL BUILDING SQUARE FOOTAGE = T.B.D.
F. PARKING: Each one-bedroom unit is required to have 1 parking space/unit.

Each two-bedroom unit is required to have 1.5 spaces/unit.
Each three-bedroom or more is required to have 2 spaces/unit.

This plan proposes that each row home unit will have either a one-car garage with a driveway space in front or a two-car garage with two driveway spaces in front. Each single-family home and duplex has a two car garage. Therefore, all of these units have at least two parking spaces. Additional driveway and surface parking spaces have been provided for guest parking as well as to serve accommodation units. The three condo buildings have under building parking and exterior surface parking. The surface parking lot to the North of Ski Idlewild Road is shared between the two condo buildings in that area and the community center building.
G. ROADWAY DESIGN: Refer to the attached road sections. All on-site roads will have 24 ' minimum from outside of drainage pan to outside of drainage pan. We are using crowned roads in most areas, although some roads may be cross-sloped. The main roadway to the south is considered a minor collector road and will eventually connect to Rendezvous, VZF, and Roam. It is our intention to have the roadways on site be private with metropolitan district maintenance.
H. RQD. SETBACKS, MAX. BUILDING HEIGHT, MAX. BUILDING COVERAGE: Refer to the attached approved Idlewild PD Zoning Map. Charts from this approval are shown below for reference. As mentioned above we would like exceptions to the side yard setback and maximum building coverage requirements due to the fee simple lot layout.

| Development <br> Standards | units per <br> gross <br> acre* | min. lot area | min. <br> front <br> width | min. <br> depth | front yard <br> setback <br> setar yard | side yard <br> setback | corner <br> setback | max. <br> side yard <br> setback | max. <br> height | cuilding <br> coverage** |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential | 20 | N/A | $50^{\prime}$ | N/A | $25^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $35^{\prime}$ | $50 \%$ |
| SFD | 20 | N/A | N/A | N/A | $25^{\prime}$ | $20^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $35^{\prime}$ | $50 \%$ |
| SFA | 20 | N/A | N/A | N/A | $25^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $35^{\prime}$ | $50 \%$ |
| MF | 20 | N/A | N/A | N/A | $25^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $10^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $50^{\prime}$ | $75 \%$ |
| Accomdation Units | N/A | N/A | $50^{\prime}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | $50^{\prime}$ | N/A |
| Non-residential | Open Space | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

*Affordable housing units shall be excluded when calculating densities.
"Maximum building coverage including parking areas and driveways. Maximum building coverage for mixed use developments shall be based on the requirement which applies to the predominant use on the first floor.
***The 25 ' front setback for residential uses, shall be measured to the garage face. The front of the building (non garage portion) may encroach up to 5 ' into the front setback. The front setback for residential uses that include structured parking for the units shall be reduced from 25 feet to 20 feet, as approved by the Planning Commission and Town Council, as part of any future subdivision plat.

Permitted Units

| Planning | Land | Area | Max. | Max. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Use | in sf | DU/Ac | DU |
| R-C | Residential-Commercial | 817,884 | 17 | 319 |
|  | Accommodation Units |  |  | 70 |
| OS | Open Space | 43,005 | 0 | 0 |
| ROW | right-of-way | 97,531 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Area |  | 958,420 |  |  |
| Total Units |  |  |  | 389 |

I. TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS: Please refer to the attached traffic impact study prepared by Aldridge Transportation Consultants, LLC, dated 1-28-2022.
J. PHASE II DRAINAGE REPORT: Please review the 2021 Phase II drainage report for further discussion with regards to drainage, and stormwater quality treatment.
K. UTILITY DESIGN: Please refer to the attached utility plan for a layout of water, sewer and storm.

## TOWN OF WINTER PARK MASTER PLAN COMPLIANCE

This project is compliant with the Town of Winter Park Master Plan. "Imagine Winter Park" Adopted January 2019. The specific elements below are examples of how we are meeting the Master Plan. The associated strategies out of the Master Plan associated with these items follow.

We have several connections to hiking and biking trails including the winter trail that we have connected through our site. We are dedicating a large portion of the site to the town along the Fraser River for public use. This project is also located across from a regional park.

These new residences will be more efficient than the majority of the current housing stock meeting all current energy codes.

These new residential units will provide much needed workforce housing. This project is within walking and biking distance to downtown. Providing convenient housing to employees that work downtown. As well as providing units that have sufficient space for at home offices. This project contains a mix of unit types and sizes and we are proposing small lock off residential areas within some of the units.

This project will be landscaped with Town approved plant species in an effort to establish native plants in and around the development.

## Specific Strategies out of the Master Plan which we are implementing in the design of this project from

 chapters 3-6.CC Strategy 1.3: Ensure that the built environment continues to be seamlessly integrated with mountain and recreational amenities (e.g. connections to trails, integration with the Fraser River, bikeable paths, etc.).

CC Strategy 3.1: Work with developers to provide recreational and cultural amenities that benefit both residents and guests alike.

CC Strategy 2.7: Support quality design and encourage unique and high-quality building construction and energy-efficiency.

CC Strategy 3.1: Fully integrate workforce housing throughout the Town's built environment.
CC Strategy 3.2: Ensure that all new commercial and residential development mitigate their impacts on workforce housing.

CC Strategy 3.3: Encourage a mix of housing for the local workforce within commercial developments.

CC Strategy 4.1: Include a mix of housing to support a variety of household compositions and income levels.

CC Strategy 4.4: Create an innovative, community-based housing delivery plan to ensure accommodation of a diverse population.

CC Strategy 5.1: Allow for publicly-accessible parks, plazas, and open spaces in both design and policy, meeting the goal of being an inviting community.

CO Strategy 3.11: Provide a bicycle system that offers both recreational and in-town connectivity and accommodates all levels of riders.

CO Strategy 3.11: Provide a bicycle system that offers both recreational and in-town connectivity and accommodates all levels of riders.

OR Strategy 1.1: Integrate dedicated recreation paths throughout the Town into a comprehensive regional network.

OR Strategy 1.4: Maintain trailhead and forest access points and easements within and through residential and commercial developments. This access can be as simple as signage and a hiker/biker/horse width easement.

OR Strategy 2.1: Develop recreational opportunities suited to short, daily activities (e.g. shorter, close-totown trails, opportunities for water play, fshing ponds, etc.).

OR Strategy 2.2: Maintain winter connectivity and access to all recreational trails including the Fraser River Trail.

OR Strategy 3.5: Work to establish and reestablish clear trail and backcountry connections between Winter Park and other communities.

EN Strategy 1.1: Protect and increase physical and visual access to waterways within and around the Town.

EN Strategy 1.2: Maintain healthy stream flows for ecological, recreational, and scenic purposes.
EN Strategy 1.4: Strengthen the Fraser River and its associated floodplain as a recreational and economic amenity while preserving the riparian habitat.

EN Strategy 1.5: Protect the viability of natural wetlands and watercourses as a key component of our natural and built environments.

EN Strategy 1.8: Extend trails and create additional linkages, as appropriate, to link to waterways such as the Fraser River.

EN Strategy 2.1: Support forest biodiversity and control the invasion and spread of undesirable nonnative plants, animals, and insects.

EN Strategy 2.2: Design trail routes to minimize ecological impacts while enhancing access and recreation.

EN Strategy 3.1: Encourage density in appropriate locations and clustering of development to maximize open space.

## CONCLUSION

This project is a unique opportunity to provide a range of housing types within close proximity to downtown Winter Park is unique. It will provide a walkable environment for the residents while the housing stock that this project will create will help to alleviate the housing shortage within Grand County. We appreciate your consideration for this project and welcome any questions you may have. Please call with any questions or comments. Thank you.

Sincerely,
RHAP Architecture and Planning


Ryan Hanneman, Principal

Attachments:

1. Land Use Application
2. Preliminary Plat Referral Agency Checklist
3. Preliminary Plat
4. Construction Plans Including:
a. Roadway Plan and Profile
b. Grading and Drainage Plan
c. Revegetation, Erosion and Sediment Control Plan
5. Architectural Site Plan
6. Preliminary Geotechnical Report
7. Traffic Impact Study
8. Phase II Drainage Report
9. Landscape Plan
10. Water and Sanitation District "Will Serve" Letter
11. Preliminary Engineer's Estimate of Probable Cost
12. Draft copies of Declaration of Covenants
13. Certification of Notification of Mineral Estate Owner
14. Disclosure of Ownership
15. Letters of Evidence
16. Previously Approved Annexation and Zoning Plan for reference
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## PLANTING NOTES:








5. Lanoscape contractor shall prouve per.unt costs for ever siz of plant materlis, and




9. IMPORTED SOLL SHALL BE USED TO SUPPLEMENT EXSTTNG SOLLAS NECESSARY To MEET THE FNSHED


 ORGANCS OF EATON, COLORADO.
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## general notes:


 Verat ARE FOUNO




THE CONTRACTOR I ADUSED THAA ALL ExSTTMG TREES ANO SHRUUS ARE TO REMAN UNLESS


 Landoscape contractor shall mantann auallfied supervisor on ste at all tume durn
CNOSTruction.

LANOSCAPEC

10. LANOSCAPE CONTRACTOR SHALL EXAMNE THE STE CONOTITNS UNDR WHICHHH WORK IS TO BE



 REOURED
12. LANOSCAPE CONTRACTOR TO SUBMT SAMPLES OF MICCELANEOUS LANOSCAPE \& HARDSCAPE SANOSTONE BOULDERS (ETC)
3. AlL Materal Ano workunashi shal be guranted and mantane for one year fom the


## IRRIGATION NOTES:



 .




## MAINTENANCE NOTES:




LANDSCAPE REQUIREMENT CALCULATIONS:

| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { LANDSCAPE AREA } \\ \hline 169595 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TREESE } \\ \text { Realive } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TREES } \\ \text { PROUNOED } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | LANDSCAPE TRANSITION ZONE | TOTAL LENGTH (LF) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { EVERGEEN } \\ & \text { RPROE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Shivus } \\ & \text { PRROVIE } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FOR AREAS WITHIN 75 FEET OF BUILDINGS, RECREATION STRUCTURES, PARKING LOTS, DRIVEWAYS, AND ROADS SHALL PROVIDE (1) TREE AND (5) SHRUBS PER 1,500 SF OF LANDSCAPE AREA. <br> FOR AREAS OUTSIDE 75 FEET OF BUILDINGS, RECREATIONS STRUCTURES PARKING LOTS, DRIVEWAYS, AND ROADS SHALL PROVIDE (1) TREE AND (5) SHRUBS PER 3,000 SF OF LANDSCAPE AREA. |  |  |  |  | B(25'W0TTH) | *2,312 | 103 | 75 | 512 |
|  |  |  |  |  | C (25 WOTH) | **,066 | 75 | 5 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0 (25 WOTH) | **65 | 7 | 7 | ${ }^{3}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | HIN THE <br> anNed |

PLANTING SCHEDULE:

| key | botancal name | common name | SIE | SPaCMG | невнт | wотH | water |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DECIDUOUS SHADE TREES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asp | Populus temuloides | Ouaking Aspen | 2.5"cal. | as shown | 30.35 | 15 | M |
| NLC | Populus angustifoia | Naroweat Cotonvod | 2.5"cal | as shown | 60 | 20.30 | L-M |
| cri | Punus vigiginana 'Canda Rect | Canada Red Chokecterery | 2.5 "cal. | as shown | ${ }^{25}$ | 20 | L-M |
| Evergreen trees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ems | Picea engemamii | Engegman Spuce | ${ }^{6}$ | as shown | ${ }^{60.80}$ | 10.15 | m |
| cBs | Piceapungens | Colorado Bue Spruce | ${ }^{6}$ | as shown | 40.60 | 10220 | X-L |
| bcp | Pinusaistala | Birstecone Pine | $6^{\prime}$ | as shown | 25.30 | 10-15' | X-L |
| LPP | Pinus contotatarar. latiolia | Lodsepole Pine | ${ }^{6}$ | as shown | $40.60^{\circ}$ | 20.30 | L |
| LMP | Pinusfexilis | Limber Pine | ${ }^{6}$ | as shown | 40.60 | 20.30 | L-M |
| wp | Pins fexilis vanteronofs Pramid | Vandemolts Pyamid Limber Pine | 6 | as shown | 20 | 10 | m |
| ORNAmENTAL TREES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| нса | Mals thopat | Hopa Crabapple | 2.2.5.cal. | as shown | $15-20^{\prime}$ | $15-20^{\prime}$ | L-M |
| RHT | Cratagus ambiga | Russian Hawtom | 2.2.5 $5^{\circ} \mathrm{ca}$ al | as shown | ${ }^{15}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | x-M |
| abs | Ameanchierex grandifiora | Atumm Billiance Sericeserry | $2.255^{\circ} \mathrm{c}$ al. | as shown | $15-20^{\circ}$ | $10^{\circ}$ | , |
| fam | Acere Ginmaa Flane' | Flame Einala Maple | $2.25{ }^{5} \mathrm{ca}$ al. | as shown | ${ }^{15}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | L-M |
| Evergreen shrubs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bf | Junipeus sationa Buthalo' | Butala Juniper | *5 | 40.0. | $12^{1}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | ᄂ |
| mps | Pinus mus | Muso Pine | *5 | 10.0 .0. | 10.20 | 1020 | L |
| DWP | Pinus mug White suc' | Dwart Mug Pine | *5 | 40.0. | ${ }^{3.4}$ | 3.4 | L |
| DECIIOUOUS SHRUBS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PBS | Pruns bessey i'aumee Buttes | Pawne Butues Sand Chery | *5 | 3.5.0.c. | 1.2 | 4.6 | m |
| RBB | Chysothamus nauseosus | Rabbitush | *5 | 40.0. | 4 | 4 | X-L |
| ${ }^{\text {a }}$ g ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Corus sericea Acticic fire | Acricic fire ogyvod | *5 | $3{ }^{\text {so... }}$ | ${ }^{3.4}$ | ${ }^{3.4}$ | M |
| RTD | Comus serica | Reatwi Dogwood | *5 | $6^{6}$, . . | ${ }^{6.8}$ | 6-10 | , |
| DNK | Phrscocarus opulifolus Nanus | Dwart Nineark | *5 | 40.0. | 5 | 5 | ${ }^{\text {L-M }}$ |
| dgm | Acerginala' Compacta' | Dwara Ginala Maple | *5 | $6^{6}$ ', . ${ }^{\text {ce. }}$ | 8 | $8 \cdot$ | m |
| APC | Ribes apinum | Alpine Curant | *5 |  | ${ }^{3} \cdot 6$ | ${ }^{3.6}$ | $\llcorner$ |
| yec | Ribes aureum | Yelow fovering Gurant | *5 | 40.0. | 4.6 | 4.6 | เ |
| daw | Salk upupuea Nana' | Dward Acric willow | *5 | $6^{6} 0.0$. | 4.6 | 4.6 | M |
| SPB | Siberin Peastub | Caragna atomescens | *5 | 40.0. | ${ }^{6.8}$ | 4.6 | X-L |
| MKL | Syringapaul Mis ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Kim' | Miss Kim DwartLlac | *5 | 40.0. | $3.5{ }^{\prime}$ | 3.5 | L |
| CPL | Syringavigais | Common Purpe Lilac | *5 | $8{ }^{\text {8 }}$, c. | ${ }^{15}$ | 8 | m |
| RMs | Rrus gabara Cismotana' | Rocky Mountain Sumac | *5 | $5^{\text {'0.0.e. }}$ | ${ }_{5} 6^{\prime}$ | ${ }_{5} 56$ | X-L |
| TLS | Rhus stiosata | Thee-Leat Sumac | *5 | 40.0. | ${ }^{3.4}$ | ${ }^{3.4}$ | L |
| SBV | Vibumum oopus sterils R Roseum | STowablv Vburum | *5 | $8{ }^{8} 0.0$. | ${ }^{8.12^{\prime}}$ | ${ }_{8-12}$ | M |
| Grouncover |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| KNK | Arctostaphlyos 'wawusi | Kinikinik Manzanta | *5 | 40.0. | 6"-12" | 4 | L |
| CMA | Maioniar reens | Creeping Matoia | *5 | $3^{\text {r }}$. . . | 18-24" | ${ }^{3.4}$ | L |
| Yar | Achiliea millefolium | Common Yarow | *1 | $24^{\circ}$ o.c. | $18.24^{4}$ | $2 \cdot 3$ | L |
| PEN | Penstemon strictus | Rocky Muntain Penstemon | *1 | $18{ }^{10.0 .6}$ | $12.24^{\circ}$ | 12-18" | L |
| AJs | Seutum specabilie Autum Joy' | Autumn Joy Setum | *1 | $24^{\circ} 0.0$. | 18.36" | 18.24" | $\llcorner$ |
| RwN | Centrantus suber Cococriness | Red valeian | \#1 | $24^{\circ}$ O.c. | 24-36" | $24.36^{\prime \prime}$ | L |
| RMC | Aquiligia ceerliea | Rocky Mountin Coumbine | *1 | $122^{10.6}$. | 8 8-12" | $12^{1}$ | $\llcorner$ |

## RAINGARDEN SEED MIX

| botancal name | Common Name | Varien | ${ }^{\text {PLS }}$ | ${ }^{0271}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Andropogen hallii | Sand blugaras | Garden | ${ }_{3.5}$ |  |
| Boutelova cutreenulua | Sideoals grama | Bute | 3 |  |
| Calamonitit onofitola | Prainie sandried | Gostren | 3 |  |
| Orionsis hymenoides | Indian icegrass | Paloma | 3 |  |
| Panicum ivigatum | Switergass | Backwell | 4 |  |
| Pascopyum smithi | Wesem <br> wheatrass | Aita | 3 |  |
| Schirachyrium scoparium | Litie busustem | Patua | 3 |  |
| Sporobolus ainiodes | Alali sacaton |  | 3 |  |
| Sporobolus cyparandus | Sand diopseed |  | 3 |  |
| Atemesiest tigid | Pasture sage |  |  | 2 |
| Aster hevis' | Bue aster |  |  | 4 |
| Gaillacria a isisala' | Baanet flower |  |  | 8 |
| Ratibida colummiera' | Prainie conetioner |  |  | 4 |
| Dalea (Petalostemum) | Purple paraiectover |  |  | 4 |
| Sub-Totals: |  |  | 27.5 | 22 |
| Tolal lis per acre: |  |  |  |  |

Wiatiover seet (opion

## DRYLAND SEED MIX:

oxoou
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| densis |
| :---: |
|  |
| Festucapeerenis |
| Festuca ovina |
| Andiopogen gearalii |
| Bouteloua a cutpentua |
| Poa compessa |
| Butelouvagracils |


| Canada Wildre |
| :---: |
| Cieseded Wheatrass |
| der Wheataras |
| Anmual ivegass |
| Sheep fescue |
| Sheep fescue Bigiusesem |
| Sideoats Grama |
| Conadad blued |
| Bue Grama Grass |
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Sojourn @ Idlewild Renderings

Image 1: Aerial View \#1


Image 2: Aerial View \#2
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Image 3: Condo \#1


Image 4: Duplexes \#1
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Image 5: Duplexes \#2


Image 6: Duplexes \#3


Sojourn @ Idlewild Renderings

Image 7: Rowhomes \#1


Image 8: Rowhomes \#2


Sojourn @ Idlewild Renderings

Image 9: Rowhomes \#3


## IDLEWILD



## Annexation and Zoning Plan <br> SE1/4 SE1/4 SECTION 28 AND

| Development Standards |  | min. lot area | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { min } \\ \text { fiont } \end{array}$ | $\min _{\text {depht }}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { front yard } \\ & \text { setback } \\ & \text { *** } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { rear yard } \\ \text { settoack } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { side yard } \\ & \text { setiback } \end{aligned}$ | $\left\|\begin{array}{c} \text { somer } \\ \substack{\text { side ayd } \\ \text { setitack }} \end{array}\right\|$ | ${ }_{\text {max }}^{\substack{\text { maight } \\ \text { hex }}}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \substack{\text { maxx } \\ \text { coviding } \\ \text { coverage" }} \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Residential |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sfo | 20 | N/ | $50^{\circ}$ | N/A | $25^{\prime}$ | $20^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{10}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | ${ }^{35}$ | 50\% |
| SFA | 20 | N/A | N/A | N/A | $25^{\prime}$ | $20^{\circ}$ | $10^{\circ}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | $35{ }^{\prime}$ | 50\% |
| MF | 20 | N/A | N/A | N/A | $25^{\prime}$ | $15^{\prime}$ | 10' | $15^{\prime}$ | ${ }^{35}$ | 50\% |
| Accommation Units | 20 | N/ | N/A | N/A | ${ }^{25}$ | ${ }^{15}$ | 10' | ${ }^{15}$ | $50^{\circ}$ | 75\% |
| Nor-resisential | N/A | N/A | ${ }^{50}$ | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | $\frac{50}{\text { W/ }}$ | N/A |
| Open Space | N/A |  | N/ | NA | N/ | N/ | N/A | N/A | N/ |  |



for resisidengial uses thet indulude structured paaking for the units shall be reduced trom 25 feet

A ORTION OF THE N1/2 NE1/4 SECTION 33 TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 75 WEST, 6th P.M COUNTY OF GRAND, STATE OF COLORADO
coverage for mixed Use developments s.
to the presominanat use on the first for


Vicinity Map N.T.S.



Definitions:
noadion Unit: Any room or group of rooms without cooking facilities designed for or adapted



2. Condominium Hotel: :Any room or grouv of rooms with cooking failites designed for or adapted to through another room or unit: A Condominium Hotele will tyicically in ielude amentities retated to to suest



 at the developer
 Hotel application, decreasesed trom 319 to 299 . Aternatively, at the developer's discretion, the total Residential U Units wouldid remain a a 319 .
3. Single-Family Detached Unit: Adetached building designed exclusively for occupancy by one famiy
4. Single-Family Attached Unit: Duplex, triplex, or townome units in one building designed for two (2)

 tomeowners' association.
.Mylit-Family Unit : Condominium or apartment units, which may include a type on onnershin which tith an undivivide simple intersti in common elements, such as yards, parking areas and recreation


## Prepared for:

Idlewild, LLC
9049 S. Forrest Drive Highlands Ranch, CO 80126

Prepared by:
■■■


## U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

## REGULATORY PROGRAM

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM (INTERIM)
NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION RULE

## I. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Completion Date of Approved Jurisdictional Determination (AJD):April 30, 2021.
ORM Number: SPK-2021-00084.
Associated JDs: N/A.
Review Area Location ${ }^{1}$ : State/Territory: CO. City: Winter Park. County/Parish/Borough: Grand County. Center Coordinates of Review Area: Latitude $39.924888^{\circ}$. Longitude $-105.781532^{\circ}$.
II. FINDINGS
A. Summary: Check all that apply. At least one box from the following list MUST be selected. Complete the corresponding sections/tables and summarize data sources.
$\square$ The review area is comprised entirely of dry land (i.e., there are no waters or water features, including wetlands, of any kind in the entire review area). Rationale: N/A.There are "navigable waters of the United States" within Rivers and Harbors Act jurisdiction within the review area (complete table in Section II.B).
$\boxtimes$ There are "waters of the United States" within Clean Water Act jurisdiction within the review area (complete appropriate tables in Section II.C).
$\boxtimes$ There are waters or water features excluded from Clean Water Act jurisdiction within the review area (complete table in Section II.D).

[^0]
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## B. Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 Section $10(\S 10)^{2}$

| $\S 10$ Name | § 10 Size | $\S 10$ Criteria | Rationale for § 10 Determination |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N/A. | N/A. | acres | N/A. | N/A. |

## C. Clean Water Act Section 404

| Territorial Seas and Traditional Navigable Waters ((a)(1) waters): ${ }^{3}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (a)(1) Name | (a)(1) Size | (a)(1) Criteria | Rationale for (a)(1) Determination |  |
| N/A. | N/A. | acres | N/A. | N/A. |


| Tributaries ((a)(2) waters): |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (a)(2) <br> Name | $(\mathrm{a})(2)$ Size |  | (a)(2) Criteria | Rationale for (a)(2) Determination $\quad$.

Lakes and ponds, and impoundments of jurisdictional waters ((a)(3) waters):

| (a)(3) <br> Name | (a)(3) Size |  | (a)(3) Criteria | Rationale for (a)(3) Determination |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pond | 0.4 | acres | (a)(3) Lake/pond or impoundment of <br> a jurisdictional water contributes <br> surface water flow directly or <br> indirectly to an (a)(1) water in a <br> typical year. | The 0.4-acre pond is an <br> impoundment of wetlands that was <br> constructed in the 1960s. The pond <br> is jurisdictional as an impoundment <br> of jurisdictional waters because the <br> wetlands being impounded meet <br> the definition of adjacent wetlands <br> and also meet the conditions of the <br> lakes, ponds, and impoundments of <br> jurisdictional waters category due to <br> a direct intermittent flow connection <br> through a culvert into the Fraser <br> River. The Fraser River is an (a)(2) <br> perennial tributary that contributes <br> surface water flow directly to the <br> Colorado River [(a)(1) water] in a <br> typical year, making it jurisdictional. |

[^1]
## U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

REGULATORY PROGRAM
APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM (INTERIM) NAVIGABLE WATERS PROTECTION RULE

Adjacent wetlands ((a)(4) waters):

| (a)(4) Name | (a)(4) Size | (a)(4) Criteria | Rationale for (a)(4) Determination |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Wetland A | 3.5 | acres | (a)(4) Wetland abuts an (a)(1)-(a)(3) <br> water. | Wetlands are jurisdictional waters <br> when they abut an (a)(1) - (a)(3) <br> water. Wetland A directly abuts the <br> Fraser River. The 19.4-acre review <br> area does not extend to include the <br> area where Wetland A abuts the <br> Fraser River but area imagery and <br> the delineation report both indicate <br> that the wetland continues outside <br> of the review area and directly <br> abuts the Fraser River. The Fraser <br> River is an (a)(2) perennial tributary <br> that contributes surface water flow <br> directly to the Colorado River [(a)(1) <br> water] in a typical year, making <br> Wetland A jurisdictional. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## D. Excluded Waters or Features

| Excluded waters ((b)(1)-(b)(12)): ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Exclusion Name | Exclusion Size |  | Exclusion ${ }^{5}$ | Rationale for Exclusion Determination |
| Wetlands B1, B-2, B-3, and $B-4$. | 0.6 | acres | (b)(1) Non-adjacent wetland. | Wetlands B-1, B-2, B-3, and B-4 are located a minimum of 250 feet from the Fraser River, the nearest downslope aquatic resource, and prominent upland features separate the wetlands from the Fraser River. These 4 wetlands total 0.60 acre and were likely formed due the presence of roads and related infrastructure located directly adjacent to each wetland. No flow paths exist connecting the wetlands to other aquatic resources. Wetlands B-1, B-2, B-3, and B-4 are non-jurisdictional waters. |

[^2]
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## III. SUPPORTING INFORMATION

A. Select/enter all resources that were used to aid in this determination and attach data/maps to this document and/or references/citations in the administrative record, as appropriate.
$\searrow$ Information submitted by, or on behalf of, the applicant/consultant: Wetland Delineation Report and Approved Jurisdictional Determination Request, dated February 3, 2021, prepared by Claffey Ecologocial Consulting, Incorporated.

This information is. sufficient for purposes of this AJD.
Rationale: N/A.
$\square$ Data sheets prepared by the Corps: Title(s) and/or date(s).
$\square$ Photographs: Select. Title(s) and/or date(s).
Corps site visit(s) conducted on: Date(s).
Previous Jurisdictional Determinations (AJDs or PJDs): ORM Number(s) and date(s).
Antecedent Precipitation Tool: provide detailed discussion in Section III.B.
USDA NRCS Soil Survey: Title(s) and/or date(s).
USFWS NWI maps: Title(s) and/or date(s).
USGS topographic maps: Title(s) and/or date(s).

Other data sources used to aid in this determination:

| Data Source (select) | Name and/or date and other relevant information |
| :--- | :--- |
| USGS Sources | N/A. |
| USDA Sources | N/A. |
| NOAA Sources | N/A. |
| USACE Sources | April 26, 2021, Corps edited Delineation Map, extracted from the applicant's <br> February 3, 2021, Wetland Delineation Report. Additional notes were added <br> by the Corps to better visualize and document the site conditions as <br> documented within the report. |
| Other state/local data (specify) | N/A. |
| Other Issues | N/A. |

B. Typical year assessment(s): In this case, typical year assesments are involved with describing the flow regimes of the Fraser River (perennial) and the culvert connection between the pond and the Fraser River (intmerittent). The Fraser River is a well-known third order perrenial stream and therefore no further assesment regarding typical year is needed for that resource. The intermittent culvert connection between the pond and the Fraser River is described by the applicant to have flows from May to Auqust during a typical year. No additional assesment is warranted.
C. Additional comments to support AJD: N/A.

| NOTIFICATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL OPTIONS AND PROCESS AND REQUEST FOR APPEAL |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Appl | nt: Idelwild, LLC, Attn: Tom Tenenbaum | File No.: SPK-2021-00084 | Date: May 3, 2021 |
| Attached is: |  |  | See Section below |
|  | INITIAL PROFFERED PERMIT (Standard Permit or Letter of permission) |  | A |
|  | PROFFERED PERMIT (Standard Permit or Letter of permission) |  | B |
|  | PERMIT DENIAL |  | C |
| $\rightarrow$ | APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION |  | D |
|  | PRELIMINARY JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION |  | E |
| SECTION I - The following identifies your rights and options regarding an administrative appeal of the above decision. Additional information may be found at http://www.usace.army.mil/cecw/pages/reg_materials.aspx or Corps regulations at 33 CFR Part 331. |  |  |  |

A: INITIAL PROFFERED PERMIT: You may accept or object to the permit.

- ACCEPT: If you received a Standard Permit, you may sign the permit document and return it to the district engineer for final authorization. If you received a Letter of Permission (LOP), you may accept the LOP and your work is authorized. Your signature on the Standard Permit or acceptance of the LOP means that you accept the permit in its entirety, and waive all rights to appeal the permit, including its terms and conditions, and approved jurisdictional determinations associated with the permit.
- OBJECT: If you object to the permit (Standard or LOP) because of certain terms and conditions therein, you may request that the permit be modified accordingly. You must complete Section II of this form and return the form to the district engineer. Your objections must be received by the district engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice, or you will forfeit your right to appeal the permit in the future. Upon receipt of your letter, the district engineer will evaluate your objections and may: (a) modify the permit to address all of your concerns, (b) modify the permit to address some of your objections, or (c) not modify the permit having determined that the permit should be issued as previously written. After evaluating your objections, the district engineer will send you a proffered permit for your reconsideration, as indicated in Section B below.
B: PROFFERED PERMIT: You may accept or appeal the permit.
- ACCEPT: If you received a Standard Permit, you may sign the permit document and return it to the district engineer for final authorization. If you received a Letter of Permission (LOP), you may accept the LOP and your work is authorized. Your signature on the Standard Permit or acceptance of the LOP means that you accept the permit in its entirety, and waive all rights to appeal the permit, including its terms and conditions, and approved jurisdictional determinations associated with the permit.
- APPEAL: If you choose to decline the proffered permit (Standard or LOP) because of certain terms and conditions therein, you may appeal the declined permit under the Corps of Engineers Administrative Appeal Process by completing Section II of this form and sending the form to the division engineer (address on reverse). This form must be received by the division engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice.

C: PERMIT DENIAL: You may appeal the denial of a permit under the Corps of Engineers Administrative Appeal Process by completing Section II of this form and sending the form to the division engineer (address on reverse). This form must be received by the division engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice.

D: APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION: You may accept or appeal the approved JD or provide new information.

- ACCEPT: You do not need to notify the Corps to accept an approved JD. Failure to notify the Corps within 60 days of the date of this notice, means that you accept the approved JD in its entirety, and waive all rights to appeal the approved JD.
- APPEAL: If you disagree with the approved JD, you may appeal the approved JD under the Corps of Engineers Administrative Appeal Process by completing Section II of this form and sending the form to the division engineer (address on reverse). This form must be received by the division engineer within 60 days of the date of this notice.
E: PRELIMINARY JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION: You do not need to respond to the Corps regarding the preliminary JD. The preliminary JD is not appealable. If you wish, you may request an approved JD (which may be appealed), by contacting the Corps district for further instruction. Also you may provide new information for further consideration by the Corps to reevaluate the JD.

Enclosure 3

REASONS FOR APPEAL OR OBJECTIONS: (Describe your reasons for appealing the decision or your objections to an initial proffered permit in clear concise statements. You may attach additional information to this form to clarify where your reasons or objections are addressed in the administrative record.)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: The appeal is limited to a review of the administrative record, the Corps memorandum for the record of the appeal conference or meeting, and any supplemental information that the review officer has determined is needed to clarify the administrative record. Neither the appellant nor the Corps may add new information or analyses to the record. However, you may provide additional information to clarify the location of information that is already in the administrative record.
POINT OF CONTACT FOR QUESTIONS OR INFORMATION:

If you have questions regarding this decision and/or the appeal process you may contact:

Benjamin R. Wilson
Project Manager
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Sacramento District
400 Rood Ave, Room 224
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501
Phone: (970) 243-1199 ext. 1012, FAX 916-557-7803
Email: Benjamin.R.Wilson@usace.army.mil

If you only have questions regarding the appeal process you may also contact:

Thomas J. Cavanaugh
Administrative Appeal Review Officer
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

South Pacific Division
1455 Market Street, 2052B
San Francisco, California 94103-1399
Phone: 415-503-6574, FAX: 415-503-6646
Email: Thomas.J.Cavanaugh@usace.army.mil

RIGHT OF ENTRY: Your signature below grants the right of entry to Corps of Engineers personnel, and any government consultants, to conduct investigations of the project site during the course of the appeal process. You will be provided a 15day notice of any site investigation and will have the opportunity to participate in all site investigations.
Date: $\quad$ Telephone number:

## MEMO

April 26, 2022
RE
Unified Development Code - Proposed Amendments to Town Code Titles 5 - Public Ways and Property, 6 - Building Regulations, 7 - Zoning, and 8 - Subdivision Regulations (PLN19-020)

## Overview:

Planning Division staff is pleased to transmit a final draft of the Unified Development Code ("UDC") to Planning Commission for review and public hearing. The goal of the UDC has been to thoroughly reorganize the Code, better integrate all adopted standards, and clarify many areas where the current language is frequently found to be problematic. This updated Code organization will provide a muchimproved framework.

The goals of this project include the following:

- Organize regulations in a straightforward, efficient, and intuitive manner.
- Eliminate lengthy, repetitive text, and condense standards into a shorter more graphic format.
- Ensure Code is legally sound, easy to use, and practical to enforce.
- Resolve known conflicts, inconsistencies, and gaps.
- Identify deficiencies.
- Separate policy statements and standards from definitions.
- Codify and incorporate design standards previously adopted as separate documents.
- Consolidate review processes and create distinctly separate processes for zoning, subdivision, site development, and variances.
- Provide easy access to the Code in hard copy and online.


## History:

In March 2019, the Town sent out a Request for Proposal (RFP) and in June 2019, awarded Kendig Keast Collaborative (KKC) the contract to draft the UDC via Resolution 1697, Series 2019. KKC has since collaborated with staff on drafting.

## Highlights of Update:

## Structure

The draft UDC has been reorganized into a simpler structure by consolidating the Code into fewer articles and incorporating standards adopted as separate documents. The new structure separates the following topics into singular articles: use standards; zone district dimensional standards and design standards; subdivision standards; and process requirements.

| Existing Code Sections |
| :--- |
| Title 6, Chapter 2 Sign Code |
| Title 6, Chapter 2A Village Sign Code |
| Title 6, Chapter 3 Design Regulations |
| Title 7, Zoning |
| Title 8, Subdivision Regulations |
| 2021 Design Guidelines |
| 1997 Residential Regulations and |
| Guidelines |
| 1997 Landscape Regulations and <br> Guidelines <br> 1994 RC-DC Regulations and Guidelines <br> 2012 Standards and Specifications for <br> Design and Construction |


| Draft UDC Sections |
| :--- |
| Chapter 1, General Provisions |
| Chapter 2, Zoning Districts and Use Standards |
| Chapter 3, Development Standards |
| Chapter 4, Subdivision Standards |
| Chapter 5, Administration |
| Chapter 6, Nonconformities |
| Chapter 7, Word Usage |
| Appendices, Design Guidelines and <br> Recommended Plant List |
|  |
|  |

## Format

The draft UDC is formatted in a more user-friendly layout containing fewer uninterrupted blocks of text and more illustrations and tables. Other applicable regulations are also linked as well as links to other applicable regulations. This means users will no longer need to navigate to the website to access these commonly accessed regulations (i.e., the Standards and Specifications, the Comprehensive Plan, etc.). The format also allows users to export excerpts into PDF format.

## Illustrations and Tables

New graphics better illustrate requirements. Such illustrations are particularly helpful in Section 3-A-7, Measurements, Computations, and Exceptions, to more clearly portray how dimensional standards are measured, as well as how certain features, such as lot lines and building height, are designated.

## Incorporated Design Guidelines

The 2021 Update to Design Guidelines is now incorporated into the UDC and, upon adoption of the UDC, the other three Design Guideline documents approved in the 1990s will be removed and nullified. This will eliminate confusion, overlap, and conflict in the application of these and ensure their accessibility.

## Improved Definitions and Use Classifications

Use definitions are included in a separate article and are grouped into a system of broad classifications and more specific categories, enabling the UDC to accommodate uses not yet anticipated.

## Consistent and Clear Language

Every section has been reviewed and rewritten for consistent terminology and succinct language.

## Major Updates in the UDC

The UDC is a complete rewrite of the various Code sections, standards, and guidelines. Below is a highlight of the major amendments:

## Section 2-B-1, Use Tables

Permitted, Special, Limited, and Prohibited uses for each zone district have been compiled into one table.

## Section 2-B-3, Limited and Special Uses

Limited and Special uses now contain greater detail tailored to each use type.

## Section 3-A-3, Residential Districts and Uses

- M-E District - Newly zoned M-E property could be platted using development types Standard, Cluster, or Conservation. Setbacks are altered based on these new development types.
- R-1 District - No changes to the existing district. Newly zoned R-1 property could be platted using development types - Standard, Cluster, or Conservation.
- R-2 District - Single-Family Attached and Multi-Family lot dimensions are reduced to better utilize the buildable lots and encourage greater common open space. Zero Lot Line and Twin Home are new permitted single-family use types.
- R-2-O District - Single-Family Attached lot dimensions are reduced to allow for Twin Home use type.
- D-C District - Single-Family Attached and Multi-Family lot dimensions are reduced. Maximum building coverage has increased from 60\% to 85\% for solely residential projects.
- R-C District - No changes
- C-1 District - Setbacks are reduced to facilitate commercial development.


## Article 3.E, Flood Hazard Reduction

Requirements for all special flood hazard areas within the Town now exist in the UDC, not only in FEMA documents.

## Section 3-A-7, Measurements, Computations, and Exceptions

- Building height measurement method is unchanged.
- Building coverage measurement has been amended to exclude roof overhangs less than 24 ".
- Encroachments into setbacks are unchanged.


## Section 3-C-2, Ridgeline and Steep Slopes

Provides additional clarification on permitting development on steep slopes.

## Section 3-C-3, Water Quality

Amended to further restrict types of permitted encroachments within the 30' water quality setback.

Article 3.G, Tree Removal and Protection
Amended to provide additional guidance for tree protection. This section does not require tree replacement as originally drafted. This will be considered as a separate policy item in the future.

## Section 3-H-3, Required Parking

Parking standards have migrated from the 2012 Standards and Specifications for Design and Construction into this UDC section.

## Section 3-H-4, Parking Reductions and Alternative Parking Plan

Amended to permit staff's review of an Off-Street Parking Reduction Request instead of requiring
Planning Commission and Town Council review. Added guidance will assist staff's review.

## Article 3.B, Building Material Standards

Exterior building materials will be codified instead of guidelines.

## Article 3.I, Landscaping, Buffing, and Screening

Landscaping regulations will become codified instead of guidelines. The 1997 Landscape Design Regulations and Guidelines will be nullified. Flexibility is emphasized while still requiring a minimum amount of landscaping on each property. Single-family dwelling types are now subject to these regulations.

## Article 3.K, Outdoor Lighting

Outdoor lighting regulations will become codified instead of guidelines. Additional regulations will ensure the Town can become a Dark Sky Community as stated in the 2019 Imagine Winter Park Town Plan (EN Strategy 3.3).

## Section 4-A-13, Street Naming and Addressing System

Street naming and addressing are formalized to ensure consistency throughout Town, especially with new subdivisions.

## Article 5.A, Administrative Bodies

- $\quad$ Sec. 5-B-4, Pre-Application Conference - This is replacing Sketch Plan. This will be reviewed at a staff level.
- Sec. 5-B-8, Public Notice Requirements - Public notice requirements have been standardized for all applications.
- Sec. 5-D-3, Minor Plat - This process has been streamlined to be a one-step approval process with only Planning Commission review and approval.
- Sec. 5-E-1, Site Plan - This section will replace the Design Review processes. As drafted, staff will approve Minor Site Plans (single-family/duplex) and Planning Commission will review Major Site Plans.
- Sec. 5-E-4, Limited Use Authorization - This is a new permit to allow staff review and approval of certain uses that require additional standards than a typical Permitted use but not enough to
warrant a Special Use requiring public hearings with the Planning Commission and Town Council.
- Sec. 5-E-10 through 5-E-12 - New permit types.
- Sec. 5-F-3, Variance - Planning Commission should review "Approval Criteria" to determine if it meets the criteria for variance approval.


## Chapter 6, Nonconformities

The Nonconformities chapter is being revised by legal counsel and will be reviewed with the Planning Commission on Tuesday, April 26, 2022.

## Chapter 7, Word Usage

All definitions have been consolidated for ease of review.

## Public Notification:

The UDC was circulated to the public on March 24, 2022 and to local developers on March 22, 2022 requesting comments. Six (6) comments have been received as of April 8, 2022 and are available here. Comments will be reviewed with the Commission at the meeting to determine if edits should be made to the draft. A public notice will be published in the Middle Park Times on April 14, 2022, providing notification of the Town Council hearings and requesting comments pursuant to § 7-10-1 of the Town Code.

## Next Steps:

The Planning Commission will review the draft today (April 12) and on April 26, both as public hearings. A joint workshop with the Planning Commission and Town Council will be held on April 19, 2022. The Town Council is tentatively scheduled to hold public hearings on May 3 and May 17.

## Omitted Policy Items:

Throughout the process, staff, Planning Commission, and Town Council have identified policy issues that will require a separate scope of work to be completed following the UDC's adoption. This includes policy items, e.g. wetland setbacks; view corridors; tree replacement; protection of wildlife corridors; and updated Sign Code (currently Title 6, Chapters 2 and 2A). Staff will work with Planning Commission over the next several months to develop a program to address these items.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Map(s)/figure(s) are attached to the AJD provided to the requestor.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ If the navigable water is not subject to the ebb and flow of the tide or included on the District's list of Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 navigable waters list, do NOT use this document to make the determination. The District must continue to follow the procedure outlined in 33 CFR part 329.14 to make a Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 navigability determination.
    ${ }^{3}$ A stand-alone TNW determination is completed independently of a request for an AJD. A stand-alone TNW determination is conducted for a specific segment of river or stream or other type of waterbody, such as a lake, where upstream or downstream limits or lake borders are established. A standalone TNW determination should be completed following applicable guidance and should NOT be documented on the AJD Form.

[^2]:    ${ }^{4}$ Some excluded waters, such as (b)(2) and (b)(4), may not be specifically identified on the AJD form unless a requestor specifically asks a Corps district to do so. Corps districts may, in case-by-case instances, choose to identify some or all of these waters within the review area.
    ${ }^{5}$ Because of the broad nature of the (b)(1) exclusion and in an effort to collect data on specific types of waters that would be covered by the (b)(1) exclusion, four sub-categories of $(b)(1)$ exclusions were administratively created for the purposes of the AJD Form. These four sub-categories are not new exclusions, but are simply administrative distinctions and remain (b)(1) exclusions as defined by the NWPR.

