



The Town of Erie
645 Holbrook St.
P.O. Box 750
Erie, CO 80516
(303) 926-2776
clarue@erieco.gov

Planning & Development Planning

Memo

To: Bonner Gilmore (Enertia Consulting Group, LLC)

From: Chris LaRue, Senior Planner

Date: August 10, 2018

Re: SK-000991-2018: Ranchwood Chartered Sketch Plan

cc: Todd Bjerkaas, Deborah Bachelder, Russell Pennington, Farrell Buller, Rob Crabb, Darren Champion

Comments:

Town staff has reviewed the Ranchwood Chartered Sketch Plan for conformance with Municipal Code, Title 10 at the July 19, 2017 Development Review Team meeting. A list of the Town staff that have commented and referral agencies that have responded are listed below. Referral comments received by the Town after the date of this memo shall be forwarded on to the applicant.

The next step for the Ranchwood Sketch Plan application is revision and resubmittal for another referral and Development Review Team review. Please make the appropriate revisions to the application materials and provide written response to address each written comment from the Town staff and referral agencies.

Paper Copies:

- 3 Copies: Written response to staff and referral comments. For distribution to: Planning, Engineering and Parks.
- 3 Copies: Updated written materials, 3 hole-punched for notebooks. For distribution to: Planning, Engineering and Public.
- 3 Copies: Updated 11x17 plans tri-folded and 3 hole punched for notebooks. For distribution to: Planning, Engineering and Public.
- 2 Copies: Updated 24x36 plan sets, rolled. For distribution to: Planning & Engineering
- Please bind and label materials for each entity listed above for ease of distribution to each referral.

Digital Copies:

- A PDF format of all of the submittal materials on 3 flash drives. The Town will provide the mailing envelope, address label and postage for delivery of the flash drives. The flash drives will be distributed to the following referral agencies:
 1. Town of Erie – internally distributed to: Planning, Engineering, and Parks

Planning Comments for the Ranchwood Sketch Plan:

General Comments

1. Request is to develop the property with apartments and some commercial along the roads. The following land use applications will be required:
 - a. Comprehensive Plan Amendment
 - b. Preliminary Plat
 - c. Rezone
 - d. Site Plan
 - e. Final Plat
2. The ALTA survey is not updated. A current ALTA will be required for the Preliminary Plat submittal.
 - a. The oil and gas facilities do not appear to be updated on the ALTA. Please provide more information about this and update the ALTA as necessary.
 - b. The proposed site plan does not appear to accurately depict the existing oil and gas facilities. Please update this as necessary.
3. The submitted Report of Mine Subsidence is dated 2007, and should be updated.
 - a. The report is not conclusive on the locations or mitigation of the mine infrastructure located on site. Further information will be required to determine any impacts due to undermining.
 - i. CGS will need to provide a review for future submittals.
4. The title of the documents should be changed to state “Ranchwood Minor Subdivision Sketch Plan”
5. The site is designated Community Commercial (CC) per the Town of Erie Comprehensive Plan. Section CC1.1 of the Comprehensive Plan lists characteristics of the Community Commercial designation as the following:
 - a. Community Commercial centers provide a mix of general retail (e.g. grocery stores, larger retailers) and commercial services in a concentrated and unified setting that serves the local community. These centers typically have a Gross Leasable Area of between 100,000 and 250,000 square feet and generally range between 10 and 20 acres in size.
 - b. The submitted application does not meet the definition of CC per the above characteristics, as it proposes developing most of the site as residential with some commercial land uses.
 - c. It is important to note the Town Board of Trustees has recently had concerns with the conversion of existing commercially designated properties to residential uses. This could become an issue with the development of the property.
6. Site is currently zoned Community Mixed-Use (CMU). Per Section 10.2.4 of the UDC, the purpose of the CMU zoning designation is:

- a. To provide for a community-serving mixed-use development at a higher scale than is appropriate for neighborhood locations. The CMU district is intended for use along key transportation corridors and at important nodes in the Town on sites of typically 5 acres or larger. The CMU district is intended to include commercial, institutional, recreational, and service facilities needed to support surrounding neighborhoods and the community at large. Medium to higher-density housing should be incorporated within or located around the district, and development should facilitate pedestrian connections between residential and nonresidential land uses
 - i. The proposal in the sketch plan is to re-zone a majority of the property to Medium Density Residential (MR) to accommodate apartments. A small portion of the property is proposed to be zoned to Community Commercial (CC) along both Erie Parkway and East County Line Road.
 1. Please double check the setback requirements for the multi-family buildings.
 2. The commercial portion along Erie Parkway should be expanded further north.
 3. Also, please perform a lot fit analysis for all the commercial lots. The lots along Erie Parkway appear to be too shallow to accommodate buildings, setbacks, parking lots, landscaping, buffers, etc. The commercial lots along County Line Road also look constrained with respect to setbacks, buffering, right-of-way, and oil and gas easement infrastructure.
 - a. Please note the 30 foot landscape buffer should be in a separate tract. The proposed sketch plan depicts the buffer as part of the lots along Erie Parkway.
 - b. A landscape buffer needs to be depicted along County Line Road (see comment # 28).
7. There is an agreement recorded against the property which imposes use restrictions. Among others the subject site is restricted from developing with a drug store, food store (grocery store), gas stations, convenience store, etc.
 - a. The Sketch Plan documentation acknowledges this use restriction.
8. A landscaping plan will be required with future developments.
 - a. Please review Section 10.6.4 of the UDC for general, commercial, and multi-family requirements.
9. An enhanced buffer will be required along the western boundary of the site where it abuts single-family homes.
 - a. The proposed 20 foot buffer is too narrow.
 - b. The preliminary landscaping plan does not depict enough landscaping in this buffer area.
10. A preliminary drainage study was included with the documentation. Please see the engineering comments. A drainage analysis will be required with the preliminary plat.
11. A traffic study will be required with the future submittals.
 - a. A signal may be necessary at Erie Parkway and the entrance into the site.

12. A parking analysis will be required with the future submittals. This will be important to determine the number of parking spaces for the commercial units. Parking requirements are listed in Table 6.6.1 of the UDC.
13. Utilities were not addressed in the submittal. This will need to be addressed in future applications.
14. Areas that are designated as right-of-way should not be within tracts.
15. With future applications documentation will be required from the ditch company regarding the piping of their infrastructure.
 - a. An easement will likely be required on the plat for the ditch.
16. Dimensions, lot sizes or compliance/ability to meet building setback requirements are not discussed within the sketch plan application. This will need to be addressed.
17. Building heights are not addressed within the sketch plan. This will also need to be addressed in the future land use applications. Maximum building heights are currently limited to 35 feet.
18. The units directly west of the Tract A and the unit to the north will presumably be looking at the back of a commercial building which would be subject to delivery traffic. It is recommended that more bufferying/sound mitigation be in place. Also further site design enhancements could be considered.
19. Parking, Carports, and Garages
 - a. Per Section 10.6.7.F.2 of the UDC address parking, carports and garages. Based upon the preliminary site plan further revision will be required. Some of the requirements include:
 - i. These items should be internalized and located away from street frontages.
 - ii. If viewed from public streets, freestanding parking structures shall be sited perpendicular to the perimeter street to reduce the visual impact.
 - iii. Carports and garages should be limited to 60 feet in length.
 - iv. Detached garages and structures shall contain similar architecture detailing, roof forms, and materials as the primary structures.
 - b. Per Section 10.6.5.G of the UDC please be sure to include bicycle parking on future submittals.
 - c. It appears there is parking marked in front of garages on some of the units. The area in front of garages should not be designated as parking.
20. Please review Section 10.6.7.F regarding Multi-Family design standards. Future submittals will need to demonstrate how all requirements will be met.
 - a. Most of the units are described as manor homes, however, the UDC defines Manor Homes as a building having accommodations for 3 or more families living independently of each other that is designed to look like a large single family home. The proposed structures do not appear to meet this definition.
 - b. The primary entrance and facade of individual buildings within a multi-family development shall be oriented towards: (1) Primary internal or perimeter streets, or (2) Common open space, such as interior courtyards, parks, or on-site natural areas or features with a clearly defined and easily accessible pedestrian circulation system. Primary entrances and facades shall not be oriented towards alleys, parking lots, garages, or carports.
 - i. Please demonstrate how this requirement will be met.

21. What are the plans for waste collection?

- a. With the proposed density you might consider central dumpster locations, rather than individual roll off trash cans.

Oil and Gas

22. Please review the UDC Section 10.6.14 regarding Development and Design Standards to Accommodate Oil and Gas Wells and Production Facilities.

- a. Required Oil and Gas setbacks for existing facilities are measured from the wells and associated above ground production facilities.
 - i. The required 350 setback is measured to residential lots and non-residential buildings, community parks, neighborhood parks and pocket parks.
 - ii. Street right-of-ways and trails shall be setback a minimum of 150 feet.
 - iii. The proposed site plan is in conflict with the required setbacks. There are residential lots and roads/drives within the setback.
- b. Are there any surface use agreements for the property?

Parks and Open Space

23. A conceptual open space and conceptual developed park plan was submitted with the application. More details about the how the park and open space requirements will be met will be required with future submittals. Please review Section 10.6.3 of the UDC.

24. Appropriate Neighborhood Park and community parks or potential fees in-lieu shall be required per Section 10.6.3 of the UDC. The Town preference is to meeting the requirements rather than pay cash-in-lieu.

- a. Neighborhood Parks fees are charged \$236,564 per acre of required dedication.
- b. Community Parks fees are charged \$3,889 per building permit.
- c. Open Space fees are charged \$48,500 per acre.

25. A Pocket park within a ¼ mile of the residents to be served would be required. Pocket parks shall comply with all Town Standards and Specifications.

26. Future plan submittals should illustrate how parks and trails connections are being made to the existing infrastructure.

- a. A spine trail connection shall be established from the existing spine trail to the west through this proposed sketch plan development. The trail will need to be clearly defined.

Transportation:

27. County Line Road is considered a community gateway per section 10.6.2.D of the UDC. As part of a community gateway the following additional standards shall apply to protect this distinct entryway into the community:

- a. A minimum 30-foot landscaped buffer shall be maintained on either side of the street. This buffer should utilize a variety of live plant material and berming to provide year-round visual interest. A minimum 8 foot wide sidewalk shall be incorporated as an integral component of the landscape buffer and landscape area within the right-of-way.

- b. All fencing facing the street shall be a maximum of 4 feet in height and should have an open character, such as split rail or picket. Opaque fencing is prohibited.
 - c. Parking shall be screened to the greatest extent reasonably practicable from the street using a combination of berming, walls, or fencing and landscaping with a minimum height of 3 feet and maximum height of 4 feet. Parking, internal drives or streets may not extend into the landscape buffer.
 - d. Permanent signage along County Line Road shall be limited to wall signs and monument signs constructed from similar materials as the primary buildings on the site. Ground signs shall be prohibited.
 - e. Garages may not be used as a barrier between the street and a development site.
28. Erie Parkway is considered a community gateway per section 10.6.2.D of the UDC. As part of a community gateway the following additional standards shall apply to protect this distinct entryway into the community:
- a. A minimum 30-foot landscaped buffer shall be maintained on either side of the Parkway. This buffer should utilize a variety of live plant material and berming to provide year-round visual interest. A minimum 8 foot wide sidewalk shall be incorporated as an integral component of the landscape buffer and landscape area within the right-of-way.
 - b. All fencing facing the Parkway shall be a maximum of 4 feet in height and should have an open character, such as split rail or picket. Opaque fencing is prohibited.
 - c. Parking shall be screened to the greatest extent reasonably practicable from the Parkway using a combination of berming, walls, or fencing and landscaping with a minimum height of 3 feet and maximum height of 4 feet. Such berming or screening walls and fencing may be located within the landscaped buffer prescribed in this Section. Parking, internal drives or streets may not extend into the landscape buffer.
 - d. Signage on nonresidential property shall not be installed in the landscape buffer of the Parkway. Signage on nonresidential property adjacent to the Parkway but outside the landscape buffer shall be limited to wall signs and monument signs. Ground signs shall be prohibited on such nonresidential property.
 - e. Monument signs adjacent to the landscape buffer shall meet the following standards
 - i. Shall be constructed from similar materials as the primary building on the site;
 - ii. Shall be a maximum of 6 feet in height;
 - iii. Illuminated signs shall be internally illuminated or externally illuminated with downcast cut-off fixtures; and
 - iv. No more than 1 monument sign shall be permitted on any Lot.
 - f. Signage for residential property within or adjacent to the landscape buffer of the Parkway shall be limited to monument signs.
 - g. Garages and carports may not be used as a screen or barrier between the Parkway and a development site.

- h. Unroofed patios, terraces or decks may project into required landscape buffers on nonresidential properties provided that the floor shall not extend higher than 30 inches above the finished grade level and provided the projection is at least 15 feet from arterial right(s)-of-way. Landscaping shall be installed to shield the patio structure that is visible above grade.
- 29. The gas line easement along County Line appears to be within in the right of way area to be dedicated; the gas line(s) need to be moved out of the right of way. Please address this concern.
- 30. Review Section 10.6.5 regarding Transportation and Access.
- 31. Please review the Town's Standards and Specifications regarding road right-of-ways. The new design for this filing should incorporate detached sidewalks and tree lawns consistent with current Town standards and specifications.
- 32. Staff has several concerns regarding access as follows:
 - a. A shared access would likely be required between Tract A and this development to meet proper access spacing.
 - b. The internal road usages would likely require wider right-of-ways. Please see the engineering comments.
 - c. The design of the access to the commercial properties on Lots 9, 10, 11, & 12 needs to be redesigned. Currently, the design allows access to the commercial pads through the internal drives of the large apartment buildings.
 - d. Why is there such a large curve in Jasper Road?
 - e. A connectivity analysis/plan should be completed. There should be more understanding of how this site will connect to Tract A.



The Town of Erie
645 Holbrook St.
P.O. Box 750
Erie, CO 80516
(303) 926-2776
clarue@erieco.gov

Planning & Development Planning

Memo

To: Bonner Gilmore (Enertia Consulting Group, LLC)
From: Chris LaRue, Senior Planner
Date: December 27, 2018
Re: SK-000991-2018: Ranchwood Chartered Sketch Plan
cc: Deborah Bachelder, Farrell Buller, Darren Champion

Comments:

Town staff has reviewed the Ranchwood Chartered Sketch Plan for conformance with Municipal Code, Title 10 at the December 13, 2018 Development Review Team meeting. A list of the Town staff that have commented and referral agencies that have responded are listed below. Referral comments received by the Town after the date of this memo shall be forwarded on to the applicant.

Staff would like to meet and discuss the comments. Depending on our discussion, the next step for the Ranchwood Sketch Plan application is revision and resubmittal for another referral and Development Review Team review or move forward to public hearings.

Planning Comments for the Ranchwood Sketch Plan:

General Comments

1. *Site is currently zoned Community Mixed-Use (CMU). Per Section 10.2.4 of the UDC, the purpose of the CMU zoning designation is:*
 - a. *The commercial portion along Erie Parkway should be expanded further north.*
 - b. Please discuss the commercial options with Ben Pratt, Town of Erie Economic Development Manager (303-926-2769).
2. *Building heights are not addressed within the sketch plan. This will also need to be addressed in the future land use applications. Maximum building heights are currently limited to 35 feet.*
 - a. Please see the discussion below regarding the proposed PUD. Building heights are not allowed to be altered with a PUD.

3. *Please review Section 10.6.7.F regarding Multi-Family design standards. Future submittals will need to demonstrate how all requirements will be met.*
 - a. *The primary entrance and facade of individual buildings within a multi-family development shall be oriented towards: (1) Primary internal or perimeter streets, or (2) Common open space, such as interior courtyards, parks, or on-site natural areas or features with a clearly defined and easily accessible pedestrian circulation system. Primary entrances and facades shall not be oriented towards alleys, parking lots, garages, or carports.*
 - i. *Please demonstrate how this requirement will be met.*
 - ii. *See discussion within the PUD section (# 12).*
4. **Parking:**
 - a. *The parking spaces at the end of some the alleys appear to be very difficult to access. A turning radius exhibit / maneuvering analysis will be required with the site plan submittal.*

Parks and Open Space

5. *Future plan submittals should illustrate how parks and trails connections are being made to the existing infrastructure.*
 - a. *A spine trail connection shall be established from the existing spine trail to the west through this proposed sketch plan development. The trail will need to be clearly defined.*
 - b. *Staff is of the opinion there is an opportunity to create a better connected trail/park connection.*
 - i. *The park on Tract 5 could be moved north, and the buildings could be moved further south. This would provide a better connection and corridor.*

Transportation:

6. *Staff would like to see how a connection point from the commercial near County Line Road to Jasper Road would work.*
7. *Staff has several concerns regarding access as follows:*
 - a. *The internal road usages would likely require wider right-of-ways. Please see the engineering comments.*
 - b. *Engineering comments will be required on the road system.*

Planned Unit Development:

8. *With the 2nd submittal a letter was submitted detailing items that are anticipated to be included within a proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) for the Ranchwood project. Please review Section 10.2.7.D of the UDC regarding PUDs.*
9. *Specifically, section 10.2.7.D.2 states in any PUD development, although it is permissible to depart from literal conformance with the individual-lot dimension and area regulations, there shall be no variation of:*
 - a. *The underlying zone districts maximum density requirements;*
 - b. **Height requirements, except in the RC district;**
 - c. *Parking requirements;*
 - d. *Loading and unloading area requirements;*

- e. Public street and alley standards;
- f. Exterior lighting standards;
- g. Operational standards;
- h. Parks, Open Space and trails dedication requirements;
- i. Natural and Scenic Resource Protection requirements;
- j. Abandoned mine requirements;
- k. Oil and gas wells and production facility requirements;
- l. Floodplain protection; and
- m. Stormwater requirements.

The proposed 45 foot height for the larger apartment buildings would not be allowed within a PUD.

- 10. Staff is concerned with allowing a reduced setback along both Ranchwood Drive and Jasper Road. The PUD proposes providing a 15 foot setback instead of the required 20 feet. These roads are considered collectors and would potentially have a high volume of traffic. This will need to be discussed further.
- 11. Staff is also concerned about reducing the setbacks along the other streets. This will need to be discussed further.
- 12. Given the requirement of the UDC, Staff would likely not be supportive of parking in front of the building frontages as discussed in comment # 5a above.
 - a. The PUD discussion states there are two Manor Home buildings that front onto parking areas, however, the only one on the plan appears to be building #24.



Memo

To: Chris LaRue
From: Matt Wiederspahn, P.E., Development Engineering Supervisor
Date: August 1, 2018
Subject: **Ranchwood Sketch Plan Comments**
CC: Russell Pennington
Wendi Palmer
Chad Schroeder

Comments for Phase I Drainage Report:

1. See attached comments from the Town's Drainage Consultant.

Comments for Sketch Plan:

1. The County Line Road access from Tract B will need to be a shared access between Lot 9 and Tract A and will need to connect to Ranchwood Drive.
2. Due to the proposed uses on both this site and Ranchwood Tract A, Ranchwood Drive will need to be the Town's Standard 80 foot wide Collector roadway section.
3. The intersection of Jasper Road and County Line Road is called out to be a roundabout in the Town's Transportation Master Plan.

July 18, 2018

Matt Wiederspahn, Town of Erie
P.O. Box 750
645 Holbrook Street
Erie, Colorado 80516

**RE: Review of Tract B, Ranchwood Minor Subdivision
PHASE I DRAINAGE SUBMITTAL**

Dear Matt:

We have reviewed the Tract B, Ranchwood Minor Subdivision submittal received on June 22, 2018. The submittal included the Phase I Drainage Report for Tract B, Ranchwood Minor Subdivision and sketch plan exhibits for Tract B, Ranchwood Minor Subdivision by Enertia Consulting Group, LLC. We have the following comments to offer:

Phase I Drainage Report

1. Use the most current version of the Urban Storm Drainage Criteria Manual (USDCM) and the Town of Erie Standards and Specifications.
2. On the Engineer's Certification and Town Acceptance portion of the report: Change the title of the "Accepted by" to Town Engineer rather than Deputy Public Works Director.
3. Per Section 100, Page 100-35 of the Standards and Specifications, further define the location of the project to the ¼ Section.
4. Identify the Leyner Cottonwood Number 1 Ditch and other conveyances on the Tract B, Ranchwood Minor Subdivision Vicinity Map within the Phase I Drainage Report and reference the irrigation ditch within the *Description of Property* portion of the report. Additionally, irrigation facilities within 150-feet of the property boundary are to be identified within the *Major Drainage Description* portion of the report.
5. Recommend referencing the Town of Erie Outfall Systems Plan (West of Coal Creek) (OSP), January of 2014 by RESPEC. The proposed Tract B, Ranchwood Minor Subdivision outfalls to the Erie Commons 1 – Reach 1, as defined in the OSP. Per the OSP, it appears that there is an existing 42-inch RCP at the intersection of Rock Creek Parkway and County Line Road that has a capacity of about 86 cfs. Per the OSP, this intersection was considered a problem area because there is insufficient storm sewer capacity without detention.
6. On page 5, paragraph 3 of the report, correct the spelling of "COSNTRUCTION" to CONSTRUCTION.
7. Within the *Specific Details* portion of the report, include flow rate calculations for the major and minor basins and summarize in the report. Recommend re-evaluating potential drainage

problems that might be encountered at specific design points based on the calculated flow rates.

8. Elaborate on general discussion of detention pond storage based on calculated flow rates. Include estimated volume of the pond and release rate. Tie this discussion to the Town of Erie Outfall Systems Plan (West of Coal Creek) findings.
9. Discuss maintenance and access aspects of the drainage facility design.
10. Within the summary of the report include information pertaining to flow rate calculations, detention pond size estimation, potential problems that may have surfaced from additional analysis.

Drawing Contents

1. On the Figure 2 Post-Development Drainage Map, show the "proposed drainage infrastructure" line style within the legend and label accordingly.
2. On Figure 2, the Leyner Cottonwood Number 1 Ditch is shown as a drainage ditch on this map. Revise legend to read Leyner Cottonwood Number 1 Ditch rather than drainage ditch. Make this correction on the Figure 1 Pre-Development Drainage Map, as well.
3. On Figure 1 (Basins A3 and A4) and Figure 2 (Basins B4 and B5), drainage basin boundaries are shown along the irrigation ditch. It must be assumed that the irrigation ditch is flowing full during all storm events when delineating basins. In addition, the portion of the ditch within the Ranchwood site is proposed to be piped. The basin boundaries must be revised based on these conditions.

Sincerely,
Merrick & Company



Jeanne M. Boyle, PE, CFM



Robert C. Moore, PE



Internal Memo

To: Chris LaRue, Planning & Development - Senior Planner

From: Darren Champion, Parks and Open Space Project Coordinator

Date: August 10, 2018

Subject: Tract B, Ranchwood Minor Subdivision, Sketch Plan

Cc: Farrell Buller, Assistant to the Town Administrator – Community Services

Rob Crabb, Parks and Open Space Division Manager

Parks & Open Space Division staff has reviewed the subject plans and offers these comments:

- Required landscaping and design of the Erie Parkway R.O.W. and medians, will be discussed with the applicant at a later date.
- Sheet 1 of 5 – The future R.O.W. identified as Tract 7 is identified as Town of Erie maintenance. Maintenance of R.O.W. will be the responsibility of the adjacent property owner per the Unified Development Code once developed.
- Sheet 4 of 5 - Staff have concerns with regard to the placement of the garages on the west side of the park. The adjacent uses as designed is not appropriate at this location.
- Sheet 4 of 5 - No trees are to be located within 55' from the point of curb return at road intersections where a stop sign is present. This applies to either side of the corner where the stop sign is located.