

LONG RANGE REVIEW MEMO

Date: January 16, 2024
 To: Dylan Monke
 From: Heather Gutherless, AICP
 Case number: 23-102980RZ (Special Use)
 Address/AIN: 61-163-00-001
 Purpose: Special Use application for Development of a day-use lift-served bike park as a Class III Commercial Recreation Facility.

Applicable Comprehensive Master Plan Sections

<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Physical Constraints</u>	<u>Community Resources</u>	<u>Infrastructure, Water & Services</u>	<u>Area Plan</u>
<u>All Development</u>	<u>General</u>	<u>Historic Resources</u>	<u>Transportation</u>	<u>North Plains</u>
<u>Business and Industry</u>	<u>Geologic Hazards</u>	<u>Visual Resources</u>	<u>Water and Wastewater</u>	<u>Central Plains</u>
<u>Housing</u>	<u>Floodplains</u>	<u>Air, Light, Odor, and Noise</u>	<u>Water Storage</u>	<u>South Plains</u>
<u>Mixed-Use</u>	<u>Wetlands</u>	<u>Open Space</u>	<u>Other Utilities</u>	<u>North Mountains</u>
<u>Community Uses</u>	<u>Wildfire</u>	<u>Recreation and Trails</u>	<u>Services</u>	<u>Central Mountains</u>
<u>Livestock</u>	<u>Radiation</u>	<u>Recreation and Tourism</u>	<u>Special Districts</u>	<u>Evergreen</u>
<u>Renewable & Alternative Energy</u>	<u>Landfills</u>			<u>Indian Hills</u>
<u>Extractive Resources</u>	<u>Mines</u>			<u>Conifer/285</u>
<u>Solid Wastes and Hazardous Materials</u>	<u>Wildlife & Vegetation</u>			
<u>Activity Centers</u>				
<u>Site Design</u>				

Comments noted previously that would be addressed through a different process have been removed.

Comments still to be addressed are in *bold italics*

Responses to comments that have been addressed with the 2nd referral are in *italics*

Does Dylan want me to remove policies that were met in 1st referral or continue to keep those in there. What would help him most.

Key Issues:

- Land use, wildfire, wildlife, floodplain, noise, visual impacts.

Land Use

- The property is located within the Conifer/285 Corridor Area Plan. The property is within an area recommended for 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres.
- Since this is a Class III Commercial Recreation Facility, it would not fit into the definition of a Community Use. Therefore, the applicant needs to address the three factors outlined below to be considered when a new development is not consistent with the land use recommendations. The applicant did provide a separate document titled "Evaluation for Applications out of conformance with CMP Analysis", however, that document did not specifically address All Development, Policy 3.

a. How the impacts associated with the proposed land use(s) will be mitigated compared with the recommended Land Uses;

- The recommended land use is 1 du/10 acres. The proposed land use is a Class III Commercial Recreation Facility. Some potential impacts that should be evaluated include wetland areas, floodplains, wildfire, wildlife, visual, light, noise, traffic, water and wastewater.
- See appropriate sections below for additional evaluation on each of these items.
- The applicant's evaluation of this item is in the Sufficiency Response Letter. They compare the visual impact and water use to the recommended land use of 1 du/10 acres.
- *Staff continues to have concerns about how the impacts to wildfire, wildlife, wetlands, visual resources, and noise will be addressed.*

b. How the proposed land uses are compatible with the surrounding Land Use Recommendations and community character; and

- The applicant notes that the current land use recommendation map contains areas of open space adjacent to large lot residential uses. They also note that they are concentrating infrastructure near Shadow Mountain Drive, while buffering the visual impact and will disperse the trail system throughout the property to be shielded from Shadow Mountain Drive. They state that the project will benefit the residences in the area by providing opportunities for improved health and economic growth and that this would offset mountain bike users from other existing areas.
- Evaluation of Special Use criteria 1 is in the document provided by the applicant and that criteria also discusses compatibility with existing and allowable land uses in the surrounding area. The applicant's analysis states that the surrounding neighborhoods are single-family dwellings at a moderate to low density. The applicant states that they intend to mirror that dispersed development with limited infrastructure by concentrating infrastructure at the base area and dispersing the trail system throughout the property.
- *Staff agrees that open space uses and large lot residential uses are generally compatible. However, most open space parks offer more passive recreational activities, rather than active recreation that is being proposed at this location. While active recreation is also many times*

compatible with surrounding uses, impacts to adjacent neighbors, due to increased intensity of uses, still needs to be mitigated. Many of the items mentioned throughout the document would increase compatibility of this proposal with surrounding residential uses.

c. What change of circumstance has occurred in the local area since the Land Use Recommendation was adopted.

- The applicant has revised their response to this factor to note that COVID increased trail use and in turn created more conflict on existing trails. They also noted the Outside 285 Plan created by the Colorado Mountain Biking Association, which includes objectives for an enhanced visitor experience and trail opportunities within or adjacent to existing trail systems and improve capacity and manage conflict in congested areas. Lastly, they noted the 2022 JCOS Forest Health Plan and how the development of this park would include wildfire treatment that would be in alignment with that Plan.
- *Done through grant with CPW. Was this adopted by any public agency, briefed to a public agency? Doesn't specifically address this park. New plans are great, but it was not a plan done by a public entity, which makes me skeptical of outreach – they say a survey was sent and 865 responses received. Due to COVID no public outreach meetings were held. I'm just not really convinced by these arguments – COVID concerns are receding, so have numbers stayed up? I agree this would provide a place specific to mountain bikers – but would it help reduce conflicts in other areas. And yes, the JCOS Forest Health Plan's objectives would be met, but would they be with any development?*
- The proposed access road is approximately 20-25 feet from the property line and there are trails approximately 18 -20 feet from the property line. The nearest home appears to be approximately 20 feet from the property line. Page 3 of the Proposed written restrictions document states that trails will be setback 30 feet from all property lines. Trails should be setback further from the property line to reduce impacts to adjacent neighbors. While setbacks are listed in the A-2 zone district for structures, there are not for setbacks for other amenities such as trails. This should be added to the proposed written restrictions. *We previously recommend meeting or exceeding the setbacks listed in A-2 for structures or developing a Non-disturbance area along the property boundaries that are adjacent to residences/agriculturally zoned properties. The ODP lists setbacks as 50 feet for any structures from all property lines. It also requires any trails to be 50 feet from all property lines. This meets the previous request. However, we would like some clarification on some of the clearing language. There is also a trail clearing width of 20 feet and a chairlift corridor clearing width of 50 feet, is the intent for the 50 foot setback for trails to be taken from the edge of that trail clearing or centerline of the trail/chairlift corridor? The restriction for the chairlift terminal is clear since we would measure setbacks from the chairlift itself.*
- *The cover letter states that during seasonal closures no guests will be permitted, with the exception of guests visiting the Property during a Special Event and that staff may visit and use the property during seasonal closures. This does not seem clear in the written restrictions. It appears that perhaps the definition of Seasonal Closure was left out of the ODP. 12.b. references "Seasonal Closure", but there is no definition. Staff use during seasonal closure seems appropriate, but we would need more justification of why a special event could be permitted and not impact wildlife.*
- *Thank you for clarifying guests vs. visitors and only using the term guest.*
- *"Other entertainment" has been removed from the ODP. This addresses our concern about that potential use.*

Physical Constraints

Slopes

- There are several areas of slopes over 30% on the property. The applicant did provide a slope analysis and it appears that structures will be constructed in areas with less than 20% slope.

Floodplains/Wetlands

- The Physical Constraints section contains additional policies about floodplains. (CMP p. 34) *There is a floodplain along North Turkey Creek, previously we requested that it be delineated on the Special Use Graphic.*

The applicant pointed out that this is a Jefferson County floodplain. Jeffco floodplain regulations would apply to this area.

- Wetlands on the property are shown on the graphic and language in the ODP states that no buildings, parking or chairlift is allowed in this area. Trails or access roads are allowed with certain mitigation techniques. This adequately addresses the Plan policy about protecting and enhancing wetlands (CMP p. 35)

Wildfire

- *This property is within a High Wildfire Hazard Risk area. A Wildfire Risk Assessment was completed by The Ember Alliance with the initial referral and was revised since then. With the revision there is no discussion of evacuation and discussion of the treatment unit appears to be changed to management units and dramatically reduced. What occurred to make these changes to the report? Is it good enough to say in the Landscaping section that the Landscape Plans will integrate the Wildfire Hazard Mitigation Plan recommendations?*
- While the CMP does not have specific policies regarding evacuation, it does contain three policies related to access in the Wildfire section. Those discuss creating shaded fuel breaks and linking existing development to New Development to provide multiple access points. Roadway mitigation is an item addressed in the Wildfire Risk Assessment. This property would not provide any road connections to the developments to the south and west.
 - *The applicant discussed a possible connection via the access road to Conifer Mountain Drive. Specific access points would be addressed if the Special Use is approved and a Site Development Plan is required.*
 - *The revised report contains recommendations for 8 different management areas. A vegetation preservation plan shows the various management areas. However, it does not appear that there is a requirement for the Wildfire Mitigation Plan to be implemented in the ODP.*
 - *A revised Wildfire Mitigation Hazard Plan was submitted for this referral. It appears the previous recommendations regarding aspen stands was removed. Management Area A, C, E, F and H talk about excluding aspen from treatment. Management Area G talks about selecting aspen to remain over other species. However, there is not ?????*
- Basecamp:
 - Clearing as much area around the parking lot as possible, while keeping Aspen stands.
 - This should be addressed in the Special Use document. A non-disturbance area could be graphically shown around the Aspen stands and/or a written restriction could note that Aspen stands should be preserved. The Special Use document should contain a section about Landscaping to note that any landscape plans will be consistent with the recommendations of the Wildfire Risk Assessment
 - Prohibit wood fencing.
 - *Wood fencing is prohibited in the ODP as recommended on page 28 of the Wildfire Risk Assessment.*
- South End:
 - Fencing of aspen to prevent browsing from animals.
 - *This was not discussed in the updated Plan.*
- There were several recommendations about signage, however, the County cannot dictate the content of signs, so this would need to be addressed by the applicant without County enforcement.
- Roadway mitigation would be covered by SDP.
- *The previous Wildfire Risk Assessment suggested a 300-foot buffer around the parking lot. So that this work could be completed on this property, we recommended the parking lot be setback 300 feet from the property lines. It does not appear that this was addressed and that recommendation is now removed from the Plan.*
- Slash mitigation would be covered by the SDP.
- The Elk Creek Fire Protection District's Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) should be followed.
 - Defensible Space is recommended by the CWPP and is a requirement for any new building permits in the County. Additionally, the applicant has submitted a Wildfire Risk Assessment that contains recommendations as noted above.

- The CWPP recommends roadway management with maintenance plans. Roadway treatments on this property along Shadow Mountain Drive should be a part of the Wildfire Mitigation work that is completed with the SDP.
- The site will be mitigated as outlined in the Wildfire Risk Assessment at the time of Site Development Plan, this should address the section of the CWPP that discusses Stand-level fuel treatments. (p. 52)
- This area is within the Conifer Mountain plan unit. It is designated at an extreme relative risk. Measures will need to be taken to reduce that risk. Primary mitigation suggestions include Defensible Space, Create linked defensible space, landscape fuel treatments, home hardening and roadside mitigation. (p. 67) All of these mitigation suggestions can be addressed if the Special Use is approved and the project moves to the SDP process.

Wildlife

- The majority of the property is within a high wildlife quality habitat area, with portions of the property along the creek being maximum quality habitat areas, due to riparian habitat and wetlands. The Plan recommends avoiding maximum quality habitat areas and reducing impacts to high quality habitat areas.
 - The applicant submitted a Wildlife Report. It noted that Elk use the property year-round and that constant use of the bike park would decrease the value to elk and other wildlife.
 - The Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife has submitted comments on this proposal and note that the area is used by elk, deer and increasingly by moose. It is also used by mountain lions, bobcats, foxes and coyotes year round. They note that this parcel has important wildlife value and plays an important role in maintaining connectivity of wildlife habitat in an area that is becoming increasingly fragmented by a combination of infrastructure, traffic and growing recreational use.
- *The revised ODP contains additional restrictions to address wildlife concerns. Those additions include:*
 - *Designation of a Wetlands Overlay with restrictions. These restrictions limit activities in this area to trail or access road crossings. Those crossings are required to mitigate impacts through bridges, raised platforms, or similar design techniques.*
 - *Limitation on lighting that there is no exterior lighting in the Wetlands Overlay or in Use Area B.*
 - *Restriction that lighting is directed away from the Wetlands Overlay.*
 - *Allowing only wildlife friendly fencing on the property.*
 - *Requiring wildlife-proof trash, recycling and composting containers.*
 - *The creation of a seasonal closure from January 1 to April 1.*
 - ***As noted above, it appears that a definition of Seasonal Closure was supposed to be included, but was not. We do have concerns about special events impacting wildlife during those seasonal closures.***
 - *These additions address the majority of comments/suggestions related to wildlife in the previous comments. While perimeter fencing is not limited, all fencing is limited to wildlife-friendly fencing, which does mitigate impacts.*

Community Resources

Historic Resources

- There are no historic resources identified on this property in the Historic Resources map.

Visual Resources

- Portions of this property, mainly in the southwest corner are highly visibility from the 285 Viewshed map and the County Hwy 73 Viewshed map.
- Additionally, the community identified the meadow along Shadow Mountain Drive as a visual resource.
 - *An updated Visual Analysis was provided. This shows the lodge and the lifts and seems to better show the clear area for the lift line and access road. The narrative also talks about how trails, and treatments and clearing for Wildfire Mitigation are depicted in the simulations. **Dylan met with Russ to pick out points to do the analysis.***

Open Space and Trails

- The Conifer/285 Corridor Area Plan contains a section regarding Trails Development (p. 21-Conifer) Policies state:
 1. Trails should provide a link throughout the Plan area. Trail design should create trails that:
 - a. Vary in length, gradient and the nature experience;
 - This proposal would provide a different trail experience than in any other location of the County. It would also provide for beginner through advanced mountain biking terrain.
 - b. Link the community, provide wildlife corridors and serve as potential greenbelts;
 - *A Wetlands Overlay has been added to the ODP. Within this area, no permanent building, parking nor chairlift is permitted. These restrictions will help to maintain a wildlife corridor along the wetlands along Shadow Mountain Drive. Previously, there was a parking lot proposed over some of the wetlands, this has been removed and restrictions would not allow that to occur. Additionally, while trail or access road(s) are allowed in this Overlay, the impacts will need to be mitigated with specified design techniques.*
 - c. Provide access for those with special needs and necessary conveyances, where appropriate;
 - The chairlift will provide access to the mountain biking for those with special needs.
 - d. Traverse diverse landscapes;
 - The landscapes on this property are relatively uniform, but there are different experiences at the north end vs the south end of the site. The paths on the property will provide access to the entire site.
 - *The applicant addressed the previous question about how the applicant will ensure that bicyclists will not create their own paths in the sensitive wetland areas.*
 - e. Provide turnouts and access to scenic views and vistas;
 - *The applicant addressed the previous question about areas to take advantage of views and vistas.*
 - f. Intersect to allow a choice of routes from a point of origination to various destinations; and
 - There will be a variety of options from the top of the chairlift and there are choices on some of the proposed trails to take a different route. However, most trails are separated to avoid interactions between beginner and more advanced cyclists.
 - g. Avoid areas containing threatened, endangered, sensitive species, or fragile environments.
 - There are no threatened or endangered species identified as existing or having potential habitat on this site. *The Wetlands Overlay restricts development in the wetland area along North Turkey Creek.*
 - h. Restrict motorized activities to designated areas
 - *The ODP contains restrictions that prohibit motorized use on trails, it does still allow e-bikes, which is a good provision. This addresses the previous concern about motorized activities throughout the site, such as a motocross track.*

Air, Light, Odor and Noise

- The Community Resources section contains policies related to Air, Light, Odor and Noise and Recreation and Tourism that should be addressed.

- Plan policies discuss minimizing light impacts to protect the night sky, avoid pollution, and avoid light or Glare trespass on adjacent properties and Wildlife Habitat. (CMP p. 43)
 - *The written restrictions have been modified regarding lighting to limit light impacts. No exterior lighting is permitted in the Wetlands Overlay or in Use Area B. Lighting in Use Area A is limited to one hour before sunrise and one hour after sunrise, with an exception for security lighting.*
- *Previously, there were concerns about lighting of the wetland area, which is maximum quality wildlife habitat. Restrictions now state that lighting will be directed away from the Wetlands Overlay.*
- The Area Plan discourages internally illuminated signs. (Conifer p. 15)
 - *The written restrictions state that signs will not be illuminated.*
- Businesses are encouraged to turn off all non-essential lighting after business hours, leaving only the necessary lighting for site security. (Conifer p. 15)
 - *Again, lighting restrictions have been modified as noted above to minimize lighting impacts.*
- The Noise policies in the Comprehensive Master Plan discuss the potential noise impacts from hours of operation, mitigating the use of outdoor speakers, amplified music, and/or paging systems where residential uses could be impacted, minimizing noise to maximum/critical wildlife Habitat areas, ensuring noise is reviewed and, if necessary, mitigated and mitigating noise that is annoying, but does not exceed State noise standards. (CMP p. 44)
- *Previously, there were concerns with allowing noise levels for Light Industrial uses and potential noise from the chairlift. The noise standards have been modified to only allow noise levels for residential uses, which is compatible with the surrounding uses.*
- *A Sensory Impact Study was included which analyzed noise. However, it is unclear how the LDR Noise Criteria, which discusses L25, L0, and periodic/impulsive standards relates to the table with LAeq noise levels shown in Table 8.1 and 8.2. There was some discussion in the report about these various standards, but Staff may need to have a meeting with the consultant that prepared the Sensory Impact Assessment to further understand the various ways to measure noise and whether the LDR standards are met.*
- As recommended by the Plan, hours of operation have been set. Those are sunrise to sunset, which seems appropriate given the type of use and that this is the restriction on Jefferson County Open Space parks.
- *The Sensory Impact Study states that there will be speakers near the day lodge outside dining area. Will those speakers just be used for general announcements, like tee times at a golf course, or will music be played continuously throughout the day? What is the purpose of those speakers and are there other ways to convey the same information?*
- *Noise will be mitigated to the wetlands/floodplain through restricting noise allowed to residential standards.*
- The Conifer/285 Corridor Area Plan have additional noise policies related to minimizing noise, considering high noise levels incompatible unless mitigation can decrease the number of noise sources or how the noise is heard, and implementing hours of operation. (Conifer p. 15)
 - *Sound levels shall adhere to the maximum permissible noise levels for residential uses.*

Infrastructure, Water, & Services

Transportation

- The Comprehensive Master Plan discusses ensuring new development has adequate transportation infrastructure to serve it and mitigating negative impacts. Also, how transportation infrastructure and parking areas should balance safety, neighborhood character, and environmental impacts. (CMP p. 48)
- Additional policies in the Conifer/285 Corridor Area Plan discuss limiting roads to 2 through lanes with appropriate turning, acceleration and deceleration lanes and limiting improvements when they are expensive and would degrade the physical environment. (Conifer p. 29-30)
- *The County's engineers had several comments on the Transportation Analysis provided with this application. Those comments should be addressed in the 3rd submittal.*
- There is no proposed Bicycle infrastructure shown in the Bicycle Plan.

Water and Wastewater

- Comprehensive Master Plan policies discuss demonstrating water is adequate and available for the uses proposed, how new development should provide adequate water for firefighting services and how

new development served by a well should also be served by a treatment system or facility in the same general area as withdrawal. A key provision in this section discusses how development should be at a scale density consistent with Locally Available Water Resources. Locally Available Water Resources are the surface and ground water that is physically in the watershed sub-basin where the development is occurring, not including water brought in from outside sources such as truck, pipeline, or other means. (CMP p. 49)

- The applicant provided Water supply cover letter and an engineering study for the water system improvements. The cover letter states that the water will be obtained in two phases. First, an exempt commercial well permit of 0.33 acre-ft per year would be requested. At the same time, the applicant will start the process for a water augmentation plan to supply the facility with 2 acre-ft per year for full build out of the facility. Water will be used for both the facility and for fire sprinkler water. Since water would be coming from a well, it would be from a Locally Available Water Resource.
- The proposal is situated in the North Turkey Creek Basin of Jefferson County. The letter from the Division of Water Resources states that "the ability for the applicant to obtain well permit(s) and the allowed use(s) will be determined at the time the permit applications are submitted to and reviewed by the State Engineer's Office". With the Pre-application, we had asked if there were water rights available in this basin. It sounds like that would be determined once an application was submitted and reviewed.
- The cover letter discusses that a water storage tank will be constructed to provide for sprinkling of the lodge building. Water for this storage tank would not need to come from the well, but could be hauled in since it would not be used for the water consumed by the lodge.
- The CMP also discusses how in areas served by an individual or community well, emphasize low water demand uses. (CMP p. 49) This proposal is estimated to use 1,400 gallons per day on approximately 235 acres. Appendix C contains a table of Land Uses with Water Estimates. If this property were built out under the existing A-2 zoning, which has a 10 acre minimum lot size, it could potentially allow for up to 23 residences. According to the Land Uses with Water Estimates table, a single-family detached unit is estimated to use 300 gallons of water per day. That would mean that there could be a total water demand of 6,900 gallons of water per day if built out to the maximum under existing zoning.
- Sanitation will be provided by an onsite septic system. Where a property is served by well water, the Plan recommends an onsite wastewater treatment facility be used as well to facilitate water recharge. The comments from Jefferson County Public Health estimate that the proposed development would generate 1800 gallons of wastewater per day. That would make the application eligible for an OWTS permit through the County. If the average daily flow is 2,000 gallons per day or more, then a Site Approval process with the Colorado Department of Health and Environment (CDPHE) would be required.

Utilities and Services

- The plan recommends locating utility lines underground, where practicable. (CMP p. 51) The power line along Shadow Mountain Drive is proposed to be buried, which would comply with the policies in the Plan and would reduce wildfire risk. Another power line would be utilized from the western boundary and would be an overhead line. *The applicant has noted that this line is an existing above-ground power line that would be tapped into. Since there would be no new power lines located in this area, it is acceptable to not bury that power line. There may be more needed at the time of SDP since burying of powerlines is in the LDR, but for the rezoning, this is acceptable. We will still want to ensure at the time of SDP that vegetation is cleared within 10 feet of any existing power poles.*
- Elk Creek Fire Protection District had many comments on how the site should be designed and constructed. While many of these would not be reviewed until the time of Site Development Plan, it is good to know what those requirements would be. Additionally, there are some items that should be considered at the time of Special Use.
 - **The Fire district talked about how an approved fire protection water supply capable of supplying the required fire flow for fire protection would be required. Would this require the installation of a cistern? If so, where would that be located and how would it impact the Special Use graphic?**
 - *The fire flow report will be submitted with the SDP.*

Design Guidelines

The Conifer/285 Corridor Area Plan contains many Design Guidelines on pages 33-48. Applicable policies are noted below.

Vistas, View Corridors & Scenic Areas

- Preserve view corridors for existing or future adjacent development.
 - We would like to see an updated visual analysis that has more vantage points and views of the lodge without a tree directly in front of it. Dylan and Russ did talk with the consultant about locations.
- In transition areas between lower and higher density uses, ensure that more intense uses are not visually obtrusive to adjacent lower density uses.
 - Setbacks will be similar to or larger than the surrounding A-2 setbacks.
- Prevent silhouette of structures on ridgelines.
 - It appears from the visual analysis that the top of the lift will not be right at the top of the ridge. However, additional vantage points will help to determine its visual impact. Talk to Dylan.
- Avoid outdoor lighting within view corridors or on prominent ridges.
 - Lighting restrictions have been modified as noted above to minimize lighting impacts. With no lighting permitted in Use Area B, there will not be lighting on prominent ridges. In Use Area A, which would be in a view corridor for Shadow Mountain Drive, lighting will be allowed, but restricted to an acceptable amount.

Parking

- Screen or obscure views of parking lots from adjacent public areas or unrelated land uses and on-site users.
 - The County's landscaping standards will require a certain amount of landscaping around the parking lot areas and within the parking lot itself.
 - The applicant has proposed modifications to the Landscaping standards that mainly have to do with preservation of existing trees and replacement of trees. Talk to Dylan, is this ok? I can see why they wouldn't want to do the preservation plan for the entire Use Area B, Do we want to allow their replacement language or just state that any tree would be replaced on a 1:1 ratio. But we want to make sure it does not conflict with the Wildfire Mitigation plan.
- Minimize parking areas (impervious surfaces) and their expansiveness.
 - Two different areas of parking have been created with a landscape separation in the conceptual site plan. See question above
- Orient building to site amenities. Separate parking from these areas.
 - The building and site amenities are adjacent to each other with the parking being between the amenities and Shadow Mountain Drive.

Signs

- Minimize the size and number of signs to avoid visually confusing roadway entrances or streetscapes. It goes on to state minimums of one sign per project per major road frontage and one sign per building, which lists all tenants.
 - Signs have been limited to one sign per building, with the exception of window signs, temporary banners and flags. Window signs, temporary banner signs and flags are not required to get a permit, so as long as they meet the Zoning Resolution requirements, this language is acceptable.
- Integrate signs into overall landscape and building design, carrying out a consistent graphic theme.
 - The applicant requested suggestions, we suggest adding language about how the signs should match the architectural elements of the primary building.
- Minimize negative visual impact of signs on adjacent areas. This guidelines goes on to states that signs should be no closer than 50 feet from adjacent neighbors, to limit signs to one per building and to limit size of a project sign to 64 square feet.

- *Signs have been limited to no closer than 50 feet from all property lines, except for Entry Feature signs, which are permitted adjacent to Shadow Mountain Drive. How far from Shadow Mountain Drive can signs be placed? 10 feet is the Zoning Resolution standard for Agricultural signs.*
- *Signs have been limited to one per building.*
- *Signs have been limited to 64 square feet.*

Fencing & Screening

- *The ODP contains fencing standards that only wildlife-friendly fencing is permitted and that wood fencing is prohibited.*

Entrances

- Limit the number of entrances to commercial developments.
 - *It is our understanding that only one entrance is proposed.*

Air, Odor, Light & Noise

- Integrate light design into overall project design and architecture.
 - *The location and hours of lighting is addressed, but the design is not.*
- Minimize visual intrusiveness of lighting.
 - *Lighting restrictions have been modified as noted above to minimize lighting impacts.*
- Minimize light falling on areas not used for activity. Areas not in use or after hours should be lighted only for essential safety requirements.
 - *See comment above.*
- Minimize the impact of people-generated noise or more quiet residential and recreation areas to a level that does not exceed normal noise levels of those adjacent uses. It goes on to recommend a minimum distance of 100' between a project's active recreation areas and existing off-site residential structures.
 - *Setbacks of the lift, as well as trails and maintenance roads, have been specified. Those setbacks meet A-2 requirements as requested.*
- Protect or preserve areas valued for the absence of man-made noise.
 - *A sensory impact study has been completed to address noise. We have questions about that study.*

Wildlife & Vegetation

- Thin forests to allow light and water, etc. to filter downward to increase forest vigor and restore understory vegetation (ground cover) which increase visual and environmental quality (erosion and sediment, runoff, growth, etc.).
 - *A Wildfire Risk Assessment was created for this project. Additional suggestions based on this report were noted above under the Physical Constraints section of this memo. If the special use is approved, any work would be required prior to construction on the site.*
- Prevent habitat deterioration where critical wildlife areas exist. Enhance available habitat.
- Maintain the natural wildlife "carrying capacity" of sites that have moderate or high wildlife significance. Improve the carrying capacity of some sites to offset the loss of habitat in developed areas.
 - *Additional restrictions have been added to protect the wetlands and stream corridor.*
- Maintain natural vegetation ecosystems adjacent to and within bodies of water, streams, other watercourses, and within associated wetlands.
 - *Additional restrictions have been added to protect the wetlands and stream corridor.*
- Maintain wildlife movement corridors of a size and character that ensure their continued use.
 - *Additional restrictions have been added to protect the wetlands and stream corridor.*

Open Space(s) & Recreation

- Prevent damage to vegetation along major roadways.
 - *Additional protection of the wetlands and stream corridor along Shadow Mountain Drive have been provided in the written restrictions.*
- Avoid using exotic plant species unless: They blend with the intended character of the overall design; no native species can be used as a substitute; they are for special effect or focus.

Circulation

- Minimize visual scarring of road cuts, or disruption of scenic areas (e.g., meadows).
 - The visual analysis should adequately capture the impacts of the trails and maintenance road.
- Preserve or create a rural image, even in more intensely developed areas
- Design pedestrian/bikeways and roadways that create attractive, pleasant and safe features for users of the facilities and residents of adjacent property.
 - This facility would create an off-road facility for bicyclists.

Privacy

- Maximize privacy, including visual and auditory, between new developments and existing residential areas.
- Maintain and enhance property values.
 - Setbacks will be similar to or more than A-2 setbacks.

Architectural Design Guidelines:

- Orient, design, and construct structures that are people oriented and facilitate interaction.
- Buildings should be small and clustered, scaled to respect topography, views and vegetation
- Balance the proportional relationship of the form of building to size of the lot/parcel.
- Structures should avoid overpowering the site and be sensitive to the natural landscape's variety and diversity.
- Use the massive elements of the building to express depth, substance, and strength, rather than only surface veneer, i.e., exposed timber, structural beams, solid rock, walls, etc.
- Create interesting, diverse, stimulating streets and walls that create varied experiences for people and respond to the landscape in an informal and organic way
- Use sculptures, fountains/water features, wood carvings, awnings and canopies, balconies, patios and terraces, flags and banners, umbrellas, the annual colors of flowers and trees (i.e., Aspen), accent lighting, painted wall graphics, etc., in detailing projects.
- Create pedestrian amenities that complement surrounding site conditions.
- Minimize negative visual impact of exposed foundations.
 - Several of these items could be added into the special use document, others will be addressed by existing regulations if this special use is approved and the project moves forward to the Site Development Plan process.
 - A Class III recreation facility does not have a size limit. A maximum size should be added to the special use document.
 - A size has been added of 15K for Use Area A and 5K for Use Area B – how do we feel about that size? 15 K seems ok, Class II would allow that.