



**Town of New Castle**  
450 W. Main Street  
PO Box 90  
New Castle, CO 81647

**Planning & Code Administration  
Department**  
**Phone:** (970) 984-2311  
**Fax:** (970) 984-2716

---

**Staff Report**

**Castle Valley Ranch - Filing 11//Portion of PA17 & Remaining PA19  
Combined Preliminary/Final for PUD & Subdivision Development Plans  
Planning Commission – May 13, 2020**

Report Compiled: 5/7/2020

**Project Information**

**Name of Applicant:** CVR Investors, Inc and its assigns

**Applicant's Mailing Address:** 1038 Country Club Estates Dr., Castle Rock, CO

**Phone/Email:** 303-549-1916; aa@hackstafflaw.com

**Property Owner:** CVR Investors, Inc. (Aaron Atkinson)

**Owner Mailing Address** Same as Applicant

**Proposed Use:** 27 Multifamily Lots (MF1), 3-plexes and 4-plexes; 91 total residential units;

**Legal Description:** Section: 32 Township: 5 Range: 90 A PCL IN THE NE4 OF SEC 31 & NW4 OF SEC 32 CONT 48.695 AC AKA PARCEL 2

Section: 31 Township: 5 Range: 90 A PARCEL OF LAND SITUATE IN THE N1/2 SEC 31 CONT 15.505 AC AKA PARCEL 5

**Street Frontage:** North – Castle Valley Blvd;

**Existing Zoning:** Residential (R) & Mixed Use (MU)

**Surrounding Zoning:** Single Family (SF2) – North & South Wildhorse Dr.  
Mixed Use (MU1) & Multifamily (MF1) – Redstone Dr.

## **I Application Exhibits:**

(Documents 1-22 submitted prior to the P&Z hearing on May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2020)

- A. PUD & Subdivision Combination Applications
- B. Application Narrative
- C. Applicant Response to Referrals - SGM
- D. Referral - Colorado Parks & Wildlife
- E. Referral - Colorado Fire River Fire and Rescue
- F. Referral - Town of New Castle Public Works
- G. Referral - Town Engineer
- H. Referral + Redlined Plat -Town Attorney
- I. Referral - Town of New Castle Police Chief
- J. Referral - Garfield RE-2 School District
- K. Resident Comment – Wayne & Virginia Shelton
- L. Will Serve Letter - Xcel
- M. Public Notice
- N. List of Property owners within 250' of Development
- O. Affidavit as to Notice of Public Hearing
- P. Agreement to Pay Consulting Fees & Expenses, February 15<sup>th</sup>, 2019
- Q. Title Commitment + Legal Description
- R. Soils Report - A.G. Wassenaar
- S. Drainage Calculations - SGM
- T. Utility Report - SGM
- U. Traffic Impact Study - SGM
- V. Snow Storage Sheet – SGM
- W. Construction Drawings - SGM
- X. Architectural Floorplans – SGM



## **II Progression of Application:**

### *Sketch Plan*

A sketch plan application for Filing 11 was reviewed by the Planning Commission on September 11, 2019 and by Council on October 1, 2019. At that time the development proposal contemplated 96 multi-family dwelling units comprised entirely of tri-plexes and four-plexes similar in style to existing units along Redstone Dr. and Foxwood Ln. in Castle Valley Ranch (CVR). The 15 acre proposal spanned both mixed-use and residential zones south of Castle Valley Blvd (CVB) and east of S Whitehorse Dr. The general concept of the sketch plan – lot sizes, open space, trails, & roads – tracked closely with a prior application submitted by Village Homes, Inc. in 2008. The 2008 application was for 62 single-family homes and was ultimately withdrawn.

At both meetings it was noted by the Applicant that the sketch plan demonstrated substantial compliance with the municipal code, adopted model codes, public works manual, and the Comprehensive Plan (CP). Staff acknowledged that the overall *design* conformance was substantial, however, it disputed the degree of continuity with the CP and aspects of the CVR Master Plan. Staff maintained that though strict compliance with the CP is not compulsory – and in some cases not practical – the CP is intended to provide qualitative and quantitative guidance for future land use. It is an instrument used to discover what manner of development

mutually benefits the needs of the Town and the aspirations of the developer.

The sketch plan process produced points of consensus and debate. Those included:

Points of Consensus:

- For a preliminary/final application, all submittal components need to be thorough and complete prior to meeting with Council.
- The Applicant's product – triplexes on Redstone Dr and Foxwood Ln – has generally been well received by buyers. The units are energy efficient with various modern amenities.
- The typical price-point has been competitive with Lower Valley multi-family development.
- High density residential is better suited along and south of Castle Valley Blvd. (CVB) rather than in the vacant parcels to the north of CVB.
- Land use proposals should prioritize the health and well-being of the community.
- The developer is currently party to a restrictive covenant committing them to no more than 303 additional residential units and no commercial development.
- An east-west connector trail should be integrated into the design.
- A looped raw water system is best practice for landscape irrigation.
- View planes should be preserved as much as feasible.

Points of Debate:

- Two-thirds of the proposed development consists within a mixed-use zone as specified by the CVR Master Plan. Areas of strategic, small-scale commercial development should be considered in fidelity with the vision of mixed-use in the *CP*.
- Pedestrian circulation should be improved to provide direct access to open space, parks, and other areas throughout the CVR PUD.
- Diversity of dwelling units should be included into the design rather than the same style throughout.
- The density and design of multi-family homes seemed misplaced when directly bordering larger single-family homes on S Wildhorse Dr. Transitions should be more subtle.
- Trail connectivity was limited. The proposed Open Space C was not useful. A park amenity would be a better use of that location.
- Off-street parking, though compliant with codes, would create ongoing challenges for traffic flow and snow storage given the density, road widths, attached sidewalks, and propensity of residents to have more than two cars per household or using their garages as storage.
- Snow storage was not adequately specified on the site plan.
- C Ave might be considered for a future emergency access road, in hindsight to the small fire that broke out on Mt. Medaris in the summer of 2019.
- There should be separation between the curb and sidewalk for pedestrian safety and snow storage.
- The proposal did not sufficiently represent the Smart-Growth model endorsed by the *CP*. Smart-Growth promotes sustainable communities with compact residential mixed with commercial amenities and services, all reasonably accessible without vehicles.

- There was dissatisfaction with not knowing the development plan with the neighboring parcels. Without visibility it would be difficult to assess the appropriateness of the current proposal with the overall community. A master plan amendment was recommended to flesh-out those details.

Per Council request, the Applicant presented the conceptual plan to the general public at an open house. The meeting unfortunately was not well attended, but the few attendees did provide feedback based on their perception of Redstone Dr. & Foxwood Ln. and their recollection of the original application for Filing 11 in 2008. The units have generally been well-built and at an attractive price-point to a variety of consumers. However there was comment that the build-out could have better planned for parking, traffic flow, and non-vehicular movement.

### **III Current P&Z Preliminary/Final Application:**

On February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2020 the Applicant submitted preliminary and final applications for a combined PUD & Subdivision plan in planning areas 17 & 19 of CVR (a.k.a. Filing 11). The application was considered complete on March 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2020. A preliminary/final application with P&Z should demonstrate rigorous compliance with the adopted codes, provisions for utilities and infrastructure, substantial conformance with the *CP*, and minimize any adverse impacts to the Town. The Commission's recommendation shall be delivered to Council within 30 days of the close of the hearing, per *MC 17.100.080*. The Commission can take one of the following actions at the hearing:

- Approve the application with or without conditions;
- Deny approval of the application;
- Continue the hearing pursuant to *MC 16.08.040 § G*.

In what follows, the application will be assessed according to the criteria outlined in *MC 17.100.090*:

1. Generally compatibility with adjacent land uses;
2. Consistency with the comprehensive plan;
3. Town's capacity to serve water and sewer and provide fire and police protection;
4. Whether land uses are permitted outright or by special review;
5. Whether number of dwelling units permitted by the underlying zoning districts is not exceeded by the PUD plan;
6. Whether the PUD utilizes:
  - i. the natural character of the land,
  - ii. provides for off-street parking, vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle circulation, outdoor recreation,
  - iii. is of overall compatible architectural design,
  - iv. achieves adequate screening, buffering and aesthetic landscaping,
  - v. avoids development of areas of potential hazard, ensures compliance with the performance standards and meets all other provisions of this title.

#### **IV CVR Purpose and Approval Criteria:**

##### *Castle Valley Ranch PUD – Purpose*

According to Municipal Code section 17.104.010, the purpose and intent of the Castle Valley Ranch PUD zone district regulations are to:

1. Encourage variety in the physical development pattern of Castle Valley Ranch;
2. Provide a variety of housing densities greater than would be normally possible;
3. Encourage the use of a more creative approach to the development of land;
4. Encourage a more efficient, aesthetic and desirable use of open space;
5. Encourage a more efficient use of energy through solar orientation, native vegetation, and water conservation;
6. Provide a variety of dwelling and building designs;
7. Provide high standards of development and provide amenities appropriate to the densities involved in the project;
8. Provide an integrated open space system throughout areas as outlined on the Castle Valley Ranch PUD zoning plan as well as throughout individual districts;
9. Provide for a variety of housing types in order to best meet the housing demands of all age groups;
10. Maintain and preserve the general alignment of drainage ways for aesthetic, energy and functional purposes;
11. Provide pedestrian networks throughout the open space districts as well as throughout individual districts thereby providing an integrated network throughout the entire development;
12. Provide landscape areas and tree plantings throughout the entire development.

It is helpful to have these priorities in mind when considering an application's degree of conformance with the following approval criteria.

##### *Approval Criteria*

#### **1) Is the proposal generally compatible with adjacent land uses?**

The property is surrounded by mixed-use and residential zoning. Currently all surrounding development consists of either single family homes or multifamily dwellings. The proposed units are modeled after the tri-plexes located off of Redstone Drive – sized between 1,600sf & 1,796sf – and include four designated open spaces.

**Staff Comment:** Since the adjacent land uses are comprised of residential and open space, and the proposal resembles the tri-plexes built in Filing 9 on Redstone Ln. and Foxwood Dr., it is reasonable to conclude that the proposal is broadly compatible with surrounding uses.

There is some apprehension with the blunt transition from large single family homes directly to the west (3,000-4,000 sf on S Wildhorse Dr.) to the higher density 3 & 4-plexes proposed. The transition to higher density may have some adverse effects on property assessments in one way or another. Because of added congestion, noise, loss of view planes, without additional amenities the homes on S Wildhorse Dr. could suffer from external obsolescence. Conversely the close proximity of the higher value homes to the proposed development may artificially inflate the property values

of the multi-family homes. These effects might be avoided by replacing some of the multi-family lots with smaller single family dwellings, particularly on the west side of Eagle Ridge Dr. Alternatively these threats might be mitigated with increased open space and ample landscape buffers.

Finally, it is difficult to assess future compatibility of the proposal with the undeveloped properties to the east – parcels which the Applicant currently owns. For example, were the current application to be approved, how would it impact the future design of the mixed-use zone PA17 to the east? At this time the expectation for this parcel is unknown. With greater visibility, however, the Town would be in a better position to determine the suitability of the current application.

Degree of Conformance: Moderate/High

## 2) Is the proposal consistent with the comprehensive plan?

The CP anticipates future development to follow the Smart-Growth model (Goal CG-5). Values of smart-growth include:

- Livability
- Efficiency
- Affordability
- Environmentally Conscious

Central to this model is the concept of “place-making”. Place-making is a strategy promoting attractive, livable communities which, in turn, drive place-based business and investment while discouraging economic outsourcing. The community’s intrinsic strengths are primary to all development concepts. Incremental building, balanced housing types, transit alternatives, recreational opportunities, and even commercial services are believed to help create attractive communities which are environmentally friendly and compatible with the community’s needs. The CVR Master Plan purposely arranged mixed-use zones contiguous with residential zones to help preserve a place for services, amenities, and public wellness to achieve these ends.

**Staff Comment:** The Applicant proposes higher density townhomes. This is a helpful first-step in restraining sprawl and resonates with the more urban flavor specified by the CP. The proposal speculates that higher density should furnish more affordable options for young families, professionals, or those looking to downsize (CP Goal HO-2). Though this affordability is not at the level of deed restriction, the units should match an attractive price-point in the Valley.

Higher density should not, however, sacrifice health and wellness. Staff believes the current proposal risks sacrificing livability with the congestion caused by bulk residential growth. A balance might be struck by eliminating some buildings while increasing some tri-plexes to four-plexes. Or, reduce all four-plexes to three-plexes. With livability in mind this move would create greater buffer space between structures to meet the topography challenges, snow storage needs, trail placement, and parking limitations discussed below.

The CP expects a balance of land-uses particularly with development over 50 lots (CP Goal CG-4A) and especially when the development lies within a mixed-use zone. A mixture of home designs, integrated service amenities, non-vehicular connectivity, and generous open space will go a long way in improving community wellness and pairs better with the tenants of Smart-Growth.

The proposal demonstrates dedication of the required 10% of lands with a grade less than 35%. This amounts to ~1.5 acres of land. The adequacy of this dedication is discussed below. Other than space allocated to pedestrian paths, only Open Space C is reserved for potential recreation (CP Goal POST-2).

The Colorado Parks & Wildlife referral indicates that the current proposal would continue to compromise wildlife habitat. The referral concludes, "If the opportunity exists for creating wildlife movement corridors on the edges of this development, they should be reclaimed using appropriate vegetation and should contain visual and noise barriers. Some wildlife species may still attempt to access the area to the south of this development, so a vegetative barrier may provide some mitigation for the disruption at the site" (CP Goal EN-1).

Is the project sustainable? The CP (Goal CG-7) and MC (17.100.060) requires a fiscal impact study by final application to determine the future fiscal sustainability of public improvements. However because of the many variables and costs involved in a fiscal analysis, a full-on return on investment study was not requested. In theory, a fiscal analysis would indicate that the Town is better off with rather than without the proposed development. Some beta to help demonstrate this benefit:

- The Town has historical placed the burden of the initial infrastructure improvements on the developer (Goal I-1A).
- The application narrative explains that the 91 units will generate roughly \$1.66 million in permit fees, water taps, recreation fees, and use tax. However, other than use tax (~13% of permit fees or \$221,000 of the \$1.66 million) and recreation fees (\$45,500 for all 91 units), permit fees are usually a zero sum.
- The Town can expect revenues for infrastructure through a portion of the 8.551 mills on property assessments. For an average townhome in New Castle this amounts to \$210/year.
- The Town can expect revenues from sales tax (29% of all sales taxes is reserved for road maintenance and another 21% is reserved for parks and recreation).
- According to Public Works, the rule-of-thumb is that the Town typically depends on \$3,640/year per lane-mile for road paving and utility repair.

A fiscal impact study would combine these metrics with other dynamics to demonstrate the economic feasibility of development. For now it should help stimulate thought regarding known revenues and expenditures.

Degree of Conformance: Low/Moderate

**3) Does the town have the capacity to serve the proposed use with water, sewer, fire and police protection?**

Per the 2002 Second Amended Castle Valley Ranch Annexation Agreement, the Castle Valley Ranch PUD is has been allocated a maximum of 1400 total units. Currently an estimated 530 lots remain vacant. Dedicated water rights are still available for the proposed development.

**Staff Comment:** Public Works has confirmed that adequate water and sewer capacity are available for the number of lots proposed. According to the CP and the CVR Master Plan, a raw water loop for all landscape hydration should be featured. A water testing station for the Filing 11 has also tentatively been planned per Public Works recommendation.

All Staff have responded negatively to the width of the proposed road right-of-ways (ROW). Currently the proposed design is for 50' ROW or 37' flowline-to-flowline. This includes two 10.5' drive lanes, two 8' parking lanes, and two 5' attached sidewalks. This indeed is the minimum requirement for all local residential roads (MC 16.28.050 §H). To improve public safety, snow storage, and optimize the pedestrian experience, Public Works recommends detached sidewalks with an additional 5' green buffer. The result would be a 60' ROW similar to N Wildhorse Dr and other collector streets. The Police Chief would preference limiting parking to one side of street based on the poor track record of moving emergency personal and equipment in the Town's multi-family residential neighborhoods.



The 50' ROW in the higher density neighborhoods becomes increasingly problematic when snow storage is taken into account. Firstly, it is not easy to push snow down the middle of the street with 21' of total travel lane and vehicles parked on both sides. The driver must be attentive to snow "wake" or throwing snow from the blade into the sides of vehicles. Secondly, when snow storage is poorly located, snow



removal becomes highly inefficient and expensive. On heavy snow days, snow will be pushed into large piles in vacant parking spaces for staging until loaders and trucks haul it off – pushing snow is quick and inexpensive; Lifting and hauling snow is unreasonable when other alternatives for street design are available. Finally, with vehicles parked on both sides of the street, snow crews usually must return multiple times to clear area where vehicles were originally parked. In the end,

narrower ROWs usually bring a cost advantage to a developer. However for the Town of New Castle, the minimized widths have proven to be an ongoing challenge.

Degree of Conformance: Moderate



#### 4) Are the uses proposed within the PUD permitted outright or by special review?

The proposal spans two distinct zones according to the CVR Updated Master Plan Map. A residential zone, colored in dijon, comprises the northern third of the development (5.1ac). The southern two-thirds, identified in red, is zoned mixed-use (8.8ac). The Applicant indicates that the site specific zoning is entirely multi-family MF-1, defined as a “multifamily townhouse and patio home district allowing for creative approaches to development with housing alternatives that are sensitive to existing and surrounding land uses” (17.104.080 A.3). In both residential and mixed-use zones, townhomes are permitted by right.

**Staff Comment:** Though the use intended is one of several permitted by right, the commitment to only residential development in a zone dedicated to mixed-use is not how the code defines mixed use in CVR (MC 17.104.080). Mixed use is purposely designated for a mixture of uses in accordance with the Smart-Growth model discussed earlier:

- MU-1: “mixed use district providing a mix of residential and nonresidential land uses within close proximity to each other that are suitably located within the community core.”
- MU-2: “mixed use district providing a mix of residential and light industrial, office uses within close proximity to each other where complementary business uses may be permitted, and where higher intensity uses will be permitted that may not be suitable within the community core.”

Nevertheless, converting the MU zones to all residential has become an all too common practice for developers in New Castle. Understandably, the alternative – nonresidential/commercial development – comes with economic risk, for it is arguably more difficult to fill commercial space. However, as noted in a previous development application, the Town struggles to correct the current imbalance between residential and commercial, which has contributed to fiscal disparities.

Staff contends that demand from the community plus demand from business interests makes provisions for commercial services and vendors more viable than in years past. The current Lakota Canyon Ranch Deli and the former veterinary clinic on 7<sup>th</sup> Street are testaments to successful business approaches integrated within predominantly residential areas. Fourmile Mountain Market in Glenwood Springs, Southside Drive in Basalt, and Eagle Ranch in Eagle are further instances of discrete commercial ventures in the heart of established residential neighborhoods.

Staff maintains, then, that the developer consider strategic locations for smart commercial options in their development plans. One suggestion might be to negotiate a zoning change which dedicates specific locations and/or functions that are deemed viable commercial areas. To move forward without any considerations means the permanent loss of another nine acres of the Town’s limited mixed-use property.

Degree of Conformance: Low/Moderate

**5) Is the number of dwelling units permitted by the underlying zoning districts exceeded by the PUD plan?**

The number of dwelling units in Castle Valley Ranch is restricted in two ways: 1) total number of units for all of Castle Valley and 2) minimum lot area per dwelling unit provided in tables found in MC 17.104.080 §H. Currently there are approximately 530 vacant lots in the Castle Valley PUD. With approximately 186.5 usable acres remaining, the average density would approach 2.8 units per acre. Furthermore the Applicant has elected the MF-1 zoning designation which limits the lot size for residential units to no smaller than 2,200sf. At this lot size the allowed density could approach an unrealistic 19.8 units/acre. The Castle Valley mixed-use zones are also allocated up to 100,000 aggregate square feet of commercial space which, like Lakota Canyon Ranch, has yet to be developed.

**Staff Comment:** The present application represents 91 units on 15ac for a density of 6.1 units per acre which, though more than double the average remaining density in Castle Valley Ranch, is far less than the 19.8 units/acre which could be allowed. If this proposal were approved the average remaining density would then fall to 2.6 units/acre. Staff believes this is manageable in theory.

In sum, though the density is significantly higher than many parts of the overall PUD, it would not affect the build-out of other parcels too adversely. For this application density, strictly speaking, should not be in conflict with the code requirements.

Degree of Conformance: High

**6) Does the PUD proposal:**

- i. **Provide off-street parking** – Castle Valley requires two off-street parking spaces per unit (17.104.100). The proposed design shows single-vehicle garages, with the driveway providing the second off-street parking space. As observed on Redstone Drive, the Riverpark Condos, and the Pyramid Peak Townhomes, this design is less than optimal and, as discussed above, compromises quality of life. In practice, these garages are used for storage, the driveway used for one vehicle, and the ROW used for all remaining vehicles. Together with sidewalks without green buffers, garbage bins in the driveway, and cars along the curb the congestion makes for an unpleasant pedestrian experience and undermines the appeal of the community. Other options exist. Staff encourages the Applicant to consider alternatives.
- ii. **Utilize the natural character of the land** – Due to the moderately sloped topography of the proposed 15 acres, some cut-and-fill will be required for construction feasibility. On the north two-thirds of the property, the Application will provide stepped lots. The lot lines will likely require retaining features such



as simple stacked-rock walls or wood tie retention. To date, these details have not been furnished.



Moving south in the development creates greater design challenges and topography alterations. Buildings 12 & 13 will require up to 36' of structural fill at the base of Ganley Hill. To remain below an 8% road grade the natural land contours will require alteration. At some point significant fill material will likely need to be moved or imported to the future Filing 12 to match the eastern grade with Filing 11. To retain the property's natural character measures such as these should be kept to a minimum.

- iii. **Provide pedestrian and bicycle circulation** – Proposed sidewalks help to provide safe egress from the street-to-home or from home-to-home. The CP (CP Goal T-1) envisions more for pedestrian circulation. Specifically non-vehicular trail systems should contribute to local recreation. Staff feels the current design has a solid start with 8' paths included to the north and to the west of the development. Staff maintains that trail connectivity could be increased internal to the development with small modifications to the development plan. A connecting 8' trail at the south end of Filing 11 and one that bisects the development is advised.



- iv. **Provide outdoor recreation** – Other than the existing Avenue C trail and a small centrally located pocket park, there is no realistic component of outdoor



recreation to this proposal. The 2008 application included a central one acre lot that was accessible from two streets. Staff encourages the development to have more useable open space than currently proposed. Elimination of Building 20 at a minimum with some grading changes will be a positive step in creating usable recreation space. An east-west connecting trail, is included in this plan set along the south end of Eagle Ridge Dr. to Bear Canyon Dr. Adding a landscape buffer of at least three feet along this trail will provide better safety for pedestrian travel.

- v. **Is of overall compatible architectural design, achieves adequate screening, and ensures compliance with performance standards** – The overall architecture will generally follow the design aspects of the approved townhomes located on Redstone Drive and Foxwood Ln. However, many of the buildings will be enlarged to four-plexes. Landscaping and screening are identified on sheets L1.0-3.0. All landscaping shall conform to requirements set forth by the relevant Town codes and verified by the Parks Department. The Applicant will be expected to agree to the performance standards adopted by the Town.

Degree of Conformance: Moderate

## **V. Subdivision Approval**

A subdivision application will be approved by Town Council only if it is found to be compliant with the criteria set forth in MC 16.16.030. A subdivision plat will be provided at the preliminary stage of the application and will be reviewed by the Town attorney and engineer for compliance. Per PZ 2019-5, "One or more amended plats to define the boundaries of the individual units within each building shall be prepared for each building envelope based on as-built surveys after construction, which may be approved on staff level." Sale of individual units may not occur until the amended plat is recorded with Garfield County. Any revisions and corrections will be made prior to Council meeting.

## **VI. Staff Recommendations:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission explore the following alternatives to the proposal prior to deciding on Resolution 2020-06:

1. Integrate areas of strategic commercial development within the mixed-use zone of the CVR master plan.
2. Soften the transition created by the juxtaposition of large single-family homes with multi-family townhomes.
3. Improve the parking arrangement and resulting traffic congestion that results from parked vehicles along both sides of the streets.
4. Expand road ROWs to include 5' green buffers between road and sidewalk.
5. Improve pedestrian circulation to provide direct access to open space, parks, and other areas of Castle Valley Ranch. Create greater trail connectivity. Possibly add an east-to-west trail corridor throughout development and along the southern property border
6. Expand Open Space C to include useable recreation space.
7. Provide a general plan for the vacant parcel east of the proposed development in order to guide considerations for how best to use the mixed-use zone, trail routing, and road configuration.
8. Eliminate Buildings 12 & 13 in order to minimize fill material at the south end of the property and retain the natural topography.
9. Consider more strategic places for snow storage to minimize removal efforts by Public Works.
10. Design C Ave as part of a greater wildlife corridor potentially accessible by emergency vehicles when needed.
11. Street names be approved through Garfield County Communications to avoid any duplication of names in the county dispatch area.