

April 5, 2023

Justin Currie

Town of Johnstown

450 S. Parish Ave.

Johnstown, CO 80534

RE: LARSON PROPERTY

PROJECT NUMBER: 1155-005

Dear Justin,

We received comments to the Southridge Subdivision submittal that was made on November 2, 2022. The following responses to the Town comments for the Preliminary Subdivision. The development team attempted to provide our best effort to address all the Town's comments.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FOR ANNEXATION

I. Town of Johnstown (Justin Currie)

General Comments

Comment 1 (pg. 1): This project will require public hearing before the Planning & Zoning Commission and Town Council, as well as a Neighborhood Meeting. Please work with your planner/project manager to schedule a neighborhood meeting. The Town's hearing agendas can become quite full, so once Town Staff feels the revised plans have reached a point that they are "supportable" at hearings, we will work to get your project on the next available hearing dates that accommodate required notifications. Prior to hearings, Town Staff will provide a Hearing Prep Checklist for additional items needed.

Response: Noted, The Developer and consultants will work with Town staff to advance the project to a point the proposed plans are ready for public hearings.

Comment 2 (pg. 1): Resubmittal is required. Please address all redlines in plans, and provide compelling rationale in writing for any comments or redlined revisions that are not made within the plans. Any resubmittals found to be substantially incomplete during review, in terms of addressing comments or providing needed information or otherwise, will be returned for resubmittal with complete materials.

Response: Resubmittal includes addressed redlines and modifications per additional comments received from Town staff in several additional meetings.

Comment 3 (pg. 1): Please review comments and redlines and reach out with any questions, concerns, or for clarification. Our reviewing agencies are generally available Tuesday afternoons 1-4 PM – please email planning@johnstown.gov to schedule an upcoming Tuesday discussion with your design team.

Response: Noted.

Comment 4 (pg. 2): Annexation Petition needs the surveyors signature.

Response: Updated per Town comment.

Annexation Map

Comment 1 (pg. 1): PUD-R (while pointing to “Johnstown Single Family 1”)?

Response: This project will be PUD-R.

Zoning Map

Comment 1 (pg. 1): PUD-R? We have several “types” of PUD zoning, I’m guessing you are looking at PUD-Residential zoning.

Response: This project will be PUD-R

II. IMEG (Gregory Weeks / Michael Cregger)

General

Comment 1: Please make sure that items addressed/noted on one sheet or location may be applicable as well in other locations within the plans and/or project documents. Please be sure to address consistently throughout.

Response: Acknowledged. We will make our best efforts to ensure plans and project documents are consistent throughout the project.

Annexation Impact Report

Comment 1 (pgs. 1 & 3): Other than minor typo noted, Town Engineering has no direct comments on this document at this time.

Response: Updated per Town comment.

Annexation Map & Zoning Map

Comment 1 (pg. 1): The title commitment provided, and referenced on the plat, is over a year old and should be updated and referenced on the plats. I did use the legal description in Exhibit A of the commitment in my review of the plat. The legal description in the commitment doesn’t match the legal descriptions on the plats, but that’s only because the plats include adjacent right-of-way of County Road 15. Using the same legal descriptions in the updated title commitment will suffice.

Response: Updated Title Commitment has been provided with this submittal.

Comment 2 (pg. 1): The proposed zoning designations are different on the Annexation plat than on the Zoning plat. They should be the same on both.

Response: Updated so zoning designations match on both Annexation and Zoning plat.

Comment 3 (pg. 1): There are two labels on the West side of Telep Avenue (County Road 15) that read “30.0 Reserved Right of Way To Be Dedicated”, and Survey Note 5, such as “when deemed necessary by the Town”, and add: “(See Survey Note 5)” under the labels along Telep Avenue.

Response: Updated per Town comment.

Comment 4 (pg. 1): Please label what the dashed circles represent that are on the plats.

Response: Updated per Town comment.

Comment 5 (pg. 1): I would think that the issue of access to the triangular Building Envelope at the Southwest corner of the project should be addressed. If the limits of both of the Building Envelopes shown are to be vacated/abandoned is there a process for that, or will that be part of the rezoning process?

Response: The building envelope easements will be vacated during the final plat process.

Comment 6 (pg. 1): Should the person signing for the owner include his title, relative to the LLC?

Response: Updated.

Comment 7 (pg. 1): Please see preliminary comments from our surveyor at upper left corner of this sheet. Once “current” <90 days from date of submission) title commitment/documentation is submitted, further review should occur and additional/revised comments may result.

Response: Updated per surveyor’s comments.

RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FOR LAND USE APPLICATION/PRELIMINARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

III. Town of Johnstown (Justin Currie)

Outline Development Plan

Comment 1 (pg. 1): Please do B&W or grayscale only. Final documents are recorded with the ordinance.

Response: Documents will be printed in black & white per the Town’s comment.

Comment 2 (pg. 1): Hannah Hill (in reference to Town Clerk in approvals block).

Response: Updated per Town comment.

Comment 3 (pg. 2): Add another sentence here: “Conceptual planning elements within this ODP are subject to further detailed review and updated requirements of the Town with subsequent submittals for development and construction plans. These elements are included to illustrate feasibility of the site for the proposed level of development and present high level development concepts only.”

Response: Updated per Town comment.

Comment 4 (pg. 2): The point of the ODP is to establish density, housing types & mix, and overall concepts. Max. density needs to be addressed. Council would like to see more housing diversity with a neighborhood. Residential will likely be acceptable, but a mix of home types, lot sizes, etc. will be sought.

Response: The ODP has been updated to include two lot types as well as an area to be developed in the future for multi-family construction

Comment 5 (pg. 2): Council is seeking min. 6000 SF lots for SF detached. Please provide a rationale as to what this lot size offers the community that qualifies for the “as good or better” purpose of a PUD.

Response: Project team is hopeful that Town Council will consider a min. 5300 SF lot size. A 5300 SF lot size and building product that fits on this specific lot size allows the developer to offer a more affordable housing product. If the lot size increases so does the size of the house, therefore a more expensive housing product.

Comment 6 (pg. 2): Clouds around spelling errors.

Response: Updated per Town comment.

Comment 6 (pg. 2): Lots along the south should somewhat mirror the adjacent existing lots to the south.

Response: The conceptual site plan has been updated to have increased lot sizes to the south.

Comment 7 (pg. 2): Where are these (reference to arrow pointing to detention ponds)?.

Response: The Detention Pond is labeled on the Land Use Map. All Open Space is shown in green per the Land Use Summary Legend.

Comment 8 (pg. 2): Staff has significant concerns with this design. Let's plan to meet prior to any redesign or resubmittal. Streets are too long and straight – creating traffic and speed issues.

Response: The site has been redesigned per comments from Staff.

Comment 9 (pg. 2): For ODP document might consider higher level bubble for large, med, attached lots...with densities and lot sizes for each – and let the detail of the street layouts for platting and engineering conversations.

Response: ODP has been updated to bubble level as suggested by Staff.

Comment 10 (pg. 2): Needs connection to the west – maybe even another to the north to make that more meaningful.

Response: Access has been added to the west for future connectivity.

Comment 11 (pg. 2): Walks should connect to the park – can that be moved more central to the neighborhood?

Response: The park has been relocated more centrally to the neighborhood.

IV. IMEG (Gregory Weeks)

General

Comment 1: Please make sure that items addressed/noted on one sheet or location may be applicable as well in other locations within the plans and/or project documents. Please be sure to address consistently throughout.

Response: Acknowledged. We will make our best efforts to ensure plans and project documents are consistent throughout the project.

Outline Development Plan/ Utility Plan/ Historic Drainage Plan

Comment 1 (pg. 2): Highlighted spelling errors.

Response: Updated per Town comment.

Comment 2 (pg. 2): Please note that the above proposed lot/street layout is unacceptable form a traffic planning standpoint. Please see comments from Public Works and/or the Town Traffic Engineer.

Response: The site layout has been adjusted to address these concerns to the best extent at this time. Further revisions will come with progression of development.

Comment 3 (pg. 3): The entire Larson Parcel falls with the following two Stormwater Master Plan Basins (TEC, April 2001):

1. Basin H1 falls within the Old Town Basin (see Exhibit 2 of Master Plan).
2. The remainder of the site falls within the Elwell Basin (see Exhibit 6 of the Master Plan).

Response: Acknowledged. Future drainage reports/studies will reference the Old Town and Elwell Basins respectively.

Comment 4 (pg. 4): The Larson Property is master planned for the sanitary to be directed north into the Town’s new North Interceptor, and not south into the existing Rolling Hills internal sanitary sewer system. The Larson site will need to install a new sanitary main north in County Road 15 (Telep) and connect into the new North Interceptor.

Before any potential consideration of routing all/some of the Larson site sanitary south, the Larson Development would need to study the entire sanitary system downstream fo their proposed south connection point and document ot the Town’s satisfaction that adequate “uncommitted” capacity exists in the system/lines downstream between the Larson site connection point and the Central WWTP.

Response: The sewer will connect to the north side interceptor at the intersection of CR 50 and Telep Avenue.

Road, Trail, and Fence Plan

Comment 1 (pg. 1): Remove specific street section details from this level of planning submittals. Specific “design” details are not to be included at this stage.

Response: Updated per Town comment.

V. Larson Property – Submittal 2 Memorandum - FHU (Jenny Grote)

General Comments

Comment 1: Providing a large park area and walking/biking trails are commendable to promote a healthy lifestyles and community enjoyment. With that perspective, I recommend that the park be more centrally located with the subdivision, and that the proposed trails be connected to the park, in addition to connectivity to other trails outside of the subdivision.

Response: The park has been relocated to the center of the project with multiple options for trail connectivity points within the neighborhood as well as to surrounding area.

Comment 2: It is recommended that an internal east/west Collector street be provided, with no homes, or a minimal amount, fronting the Collector street.

Response: The need for a collector street through the development will be addressed later in the project with the suggestions outlined in the traffic impact study.

Comment 3: External to the site, it is recommended that Right-of-Way be preserved on the west boundary for a future Collector street.

Response: There is no connection point for a collector street on the west side of the project. None will be provided.

Comment 4: I also have concerns with the south connection going into the existing Rolling Hills Ranch subdivision, on Brittany Avenue, as that will be used as a major cut through route to avoid the traffic signal on Telep to access SH 60. Future traffic calming within Rolling Hills Ranch is also envisioned unless this connection is eliminated or used solely for emergency vehicle access.

Response: This connection cannot be restricted to emergency vehicle access.

Comment 5: A Traffic Impact Analysis is needed to fully determine potential traffic impacts and to identify needed improvement on Telep and/or within Rolling Hills Ranch subdivision. A TIS document, once submitted, will be reviewed and comment on by FHU.

Response: Acknowledged.

Sincerely,

NORTHERN ENGINEERING SERVICES, INC.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Robbie Lauer'.

Robbie Lauer

Senior Project Manager