



AGENDA
Planning & Zoning Commission
Tuesday, March 2, 2021
6:00 PM

ON-LINE MEETING

This agenda and the meetings can be viewed at www.Townofeagle.org.

PUBLIC WIFI - TOEG – townofeagle2019

MEETING ACCESS INFORMATION AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

1.
 - Virtual Meeting Procedure
 - Register in advance for this meeting [here](#).
 - Public comments can be made when the Chair opens the public comment. Please prompt through Zoom to raise your hand and you will be called on when it is your turn.
 - All public attendees will be muted during the meeting, unless the Chair or meeting facilitator invites them to speak live during the meeting.
 - Meetings are recorded and will be published on the Town's web page.
 - For technical difficulties, please email peyton.heitzman@townofeagle.org and we will do our best to assist you.

6:00 PM - REGULAR MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

PUBLIC COMMENT

Citizens are invited to comment on any item not on tonight's Agenda. Please limit your comments to three (3) minutes per topic, unless arrangements have been made for a presentation with the Administrative Technician. Those who are speaking are requested to provide their name and address prior to beginning.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Project: Powell Annexation Zoning Review
File # RZ20-01
Applicant: William and Nancy Powell
Location: 21 & 25 Violet Lane
Staff Contact: Peyton Heitzman, Planner I
Request: Request to zone two parcels of land in unincorporated Eagle County to Town of Eagle Residential Medium (RM) zoning.
2. Project: Haymeadow PUD Amendment
File # PUDA20-01

Applicant: Brandon Cohen, Abrika Properties, LLC
Rick Pylman, Pylman & Associates, Inc.
Scott Schlosser, Owner's Representative

Location 660 acres south and east of Sylvan Lake Rd and Brush Creek Rd


Staff Contact: Jessica Lake, Planner I

Request: Two requests for a major PUD amendment within the Haymeadow development. 1) Request to swap the School Land portion of Tract E with multi-family development and to allocate a different parcel for a future school site. 2) Request to renovate an existing cabin currently located in open space to the East of Neighborhood D as an event space and to swap this open space parcel with land equal in size and desirability.

OPEN DISCUSSION

ADJOURN

I hereby certify that the above Notice of Meeting was posted by me in the designated location at least 24 hours prior to said meeting.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Jessica Lake', is written over a horizontal line.

Jessica Lake
Planner I



STAFF REPORT AND CERTIFICATE OF RECOMMENDATION

TO: Planning & Zoning Commission

FROM: Community Development Department

DATE: March 2, 2021

FILE NUMBER: RZ20-01

PROJECT: Powell Park Annexation

REQUEST: Request to zone two parcels of land in unincorporated Eagle County to Town of Eagle Residential Medium (RM) zoning.

APPLICANTS: William and Nancy Powell

LOCATION: 21 & 25 Violet Lane

CODE: Chapter 4.04 Zoning
Chapter 4.05 Zoning Review

ZONING: (Existing) Planned Unit Development (PUD) in unincorporated Eagle County

EXHIBITS:

- A: Project Application and Narrative
- B: Petition for zoning
- C: Site Plan
- D: Aerial Map
- E: Site Photos
- F: Sections of Eagle River Corridor Plan

PUBLIC COMMENT: No public comments received as of February 26, 2021.

STAFF: Peyton Heitzman, Planner I – peyton.heiztman@townofeagle.org

INTRODUCTION

On January 26, 2021, the Town Council passed Resolution 14, Series 2021 finding the Annexation Petition for Powell Park to be in substantial compliance with Section 31-12-107(1) C.R.S. The annexation application was accompanied by a request to zone the property to Residential Medium (RM) zoning. The two parcels of the Powell Park Subdivision are currently in unincorporated Eagle County and zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD).

The property is located north of the Sylvan Lake Road roundabout off Highway 6. The project consists of two lots under the sole ownership of William and Nancy Powell. Of the total 9.0256 acres that make up the proposed annexation and zoning, Lot 1 is 1.6275 acres and Lot 2 is 7.3981 acres. There is a single-family unit on Lot 2 and fourplex on Lot 1. The applicants are proposing to raze the fourplex and plat two single-family lots.



Should Town Council approve the annexation application for the Powell Park Subdivision on March 23rd, 2021, the Planning & Zoning Commission's recommendation for zoning will be considered as part of a subsequent zoning approval for the property.

DISCUSSION ITEM(S)

1. Is the proposed RM zoning supported by the Eagle River Corridor Plan?

STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL (SECTION 4.05.030.A.)

The conditions for zoning as described in Section 4.05.030 of the Land Use and Development Code are:

STANDARD #1: *That the rezoning is compatible with surrounding land uses, and is consistent with the Town's goals, policies and plans.*

Staff comment: Staff believes the proposed residential zoning is appropriate for this property because it complements the surrounding land uses. The adjacent properties to east and west of the Powell Park Subdivision have low-density residential uses. The County Fairgrounds is north of the property. The Fairgrounds and the adjacent property to the west are in unincorporated Eagle County. To the south of the property, across Grand Avenue, are additional residential and commercial uses. With the development of the property, there will be a decrease in density, resulting in less impact to the adjacent properties than currently exists.

When reviewing the project for consistency with the Town's goals, policies, and plans, staff was guided by the following documents:

- 1) The Elevate Eagle Comprehensive Plan (2020)
- 2) The Eagle River Corridor Plan (2015)
- 3) Title 4 of the Land Use and Development Code

Elevate Eagle Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan)

Zoning the property is supported by policies in the Comp Plan including:

- Policy 2-2.6. Encourage infill and redevelopment of rundown, outdated, or underutilized parcels on Highway 6 to support Broadway.
- Policy 2-3.3.a. Ensure residential infill and redevelopment blend appropriately with the character and scale of surrounding neighborhoods.
- Policy 2-3.3.b Utilized infill and conservation-oriented development to accommodate growth while retaining open lands and protecting environmentally sensitive areas.

Staff Comment: The annexation and redevelopment of the property will result in the replacement of an outdated 4-plex with two single-family homes. The annexation application is designating a no-build zone on Lot 2 to the south of the single-family home, allowing this application (annexation and zoning) to meet Policy 2-3.3.b. to protect environmentally sensitive areas from development.

The Powell Park subdivision is within the Town of Eagle's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). The UGB can be found in the Future Land Use Map of the Comp Plan. The Comp Plan defers to the Eagle River Corridor Subarea Plan for the future land use designations of properties along the Eagle River, including this property.

Eagle River Corridor Subarea Plan (ER Corridor Plan)

Staff comment: The applicants are requesting Residential Medium zoning which is supported by the ER Corridor Plan. Chapter 2 of the ER Corridor Plan proposes Medium Density Residential (MDR) as the future land use for the area. Uses in the MDR include single-family homes, duplexes, and multi-family residential. The applicants are proposing to develop two single-family homes, although they could develop the property under any allowed use in the approved zone district. The MDR designation is described as *a node of residential development on the higher, flatter land adjacent to the Sylvan Lake Road roundabout. Development in this area should be designed to avoid impact to the wetlands, riparian vegetation, and pond in the eastern portion of the MDR area.* The eastern portion of the property, south of the single-family home, will be the previously mentioned no-build zone. The MDR future land use description is included as an attachment in the packet along with the Future Land Use Plan.



Page 20 Eagle River Corridor Plan featuring Future Land Use Designation for the property

Title 4 Land Use and Development Code

Staff Comment: Staff has reviewed the existing structures on Lot 1 and 2 to confirm compliance with the zoning standards for the Town's Residential Medium (RM) zone district. The lots meet the RM zone districts standards for maximum lot area, maximum lot area/dwelling unit, maximum lot coverage, and maximum floor area. The residential buildings on both lots meet existing front and side yard setbacks as well as the 50' live stream setback to the rear of the yard, measured from the high-water mark from the Eagle River.

There are three accessory structures on the lots. Lot 1 has two garden sheds and Lot 2 has an accessory garage. Accessory structures may observe a 7½ foot side yard setback under Section 4.04.100.H.7.a of the Municipal Code. The shed to the far west of the property only has a 1' side yard setback. However, the applicants plan to raze the non-conforming shed with the 4-plex following the annexation of the property. All other setbacks comply with RM zoning standards. The other garden shed and the accessory garage meet the minimum side, front, and rear yard/live stream setbacks for the RM zone district.

Section 4.15 of the Municipal Code requires all areas annexed within the Town to adopt Town zoning within 90 days of approval of annexation. The Planning and Zoning Commission will need to provide a zoning recommendation to Town Council whether that zoning be the requested RM zoning or another zone district that the Commission deems more appropriate for the property.

STANDARD #2: *That the land to be rezoned was previously zoned in error or the existing zoning is inconsistent with the Town's goals, policies and plans.*

Staff Comment: The application meets this standard. The existing County PUD zoning is inconsistent with the Town of Eagle Urban Growth Boundary and the future land use proposed in the Eagle River Corridor Plan.

STANDARD #3: *That the area for which rezoning is requested has changed substantially such that the proposed rezoning better meets the needs of the community; OR*

Staff Comment: If the annexation application is approved by Town Council, the Powell Park Subdivision will have changed substantially through incorporation into Town of Eagle boundaries and connection to Town services. The proposed zoning better meets the needs of the community through its alignment with the Town's long-range planning documents.

STANDARD #4: *That the rezoning is incidental to a comprehensive revision of the Town's zoning map which recognizes a change in conditions and is consistent with the Town's goals, policies and plans.*

Staff Comment: Standard not applicable to application.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends APPROVAL for the zoning of 21 & 25 Violet Lane from Eagle County PUD zoning to Town of Eagle Residential Medium zoning based on Standards (1), (2), and (3) of Section 4.05.030. of the Municipal Code.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION POTENTIAL MOTIONS

Below are the Planning and Zoning Commission options related to the zoning of file number RZ20-01:

1. Recommend approval with no conditions.
2. Recommend approve with conditions.
3. Continue (table) the application. (Provide staff and the applicant detail regarding information needed for a decision).
4. Recommend Denial. (Cite all Code sections and/or Plan policies that resulted in motion for denial)

SUGGESTED MOTION:

I move to RECOMMEND APPROVAL File # RZ20-01 Zoning 21 & 25 Violet Lane with no conditions, based on the following findings:

FINDINGS OF FACT

The application meets the requirements of Title 4 of the Land Use and Development Code and is in conformance with the 2020 Elevate Eagle Comprehensive Plan and the Eagle River Corridor Plan.

Exhibit A



TOWN OF EAGLE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
 200 BROADWAY • PO BOX 609 • EAGLE, CO 81631
 PHONE: 970-328-9655 • FAX: 970-328-9656
 www.townofeagle.org

LAND USE & DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

Pursuant to the Land Use & Development Code, Title 4

ZONING REVIEW	DEVELOPMENT REVIEW	SUBDIVISION REVIEW
☐ Special Use Permit ☐ Zoning Variance ☒ Rezoning ☐ Temporary Use Permit ☐ Amendment to Zone District Regulations ☐ Encroachment Permit	☐ Minor Development Permit ☐ Major Development Permit PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) REVIEW ☐ PUD Zoning Plan ☐ PUD Development Plan	☐ Concept Plan ☐ Preliminary Plan ☐ Final Plat ☐ Lot Line Adjustment ☐ Condominium / Townhouse ☐ Minor Subdivision

PROJECT NAME Powell Park Subdivision
 PRESENT ZONE DISTRICT PUD (Eagle County) PROPOSED ZONE DISTRICT RM
 (if applicable)

LOCATION
 STREET ADDRESS 21, 25 Violet Lane

PROPERTY DESCRIPTION
 SUBDIVISION Powell Park LOT(S) 1, 2 BLOCK _____
 (attach legal description if not part of a subdivision)

DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION/PURPOSE Applicant seeks traditional RM zoning to provide flexibility for both single family and multi-family uses

APPLICANT NAME William Powell PHONE 970 471 0748
 ADDRESS 21 Violet Lane, PO Box 1227 Eagle EMAIL powell-willy@gmail.com
 OWNER OF RECORD The Powell Family Trust PHONE same
 ADDRESS same EMAIL same
 REPRESENTATIVE* _____ PHONE _____
 ADDRESS _____ EMAIL _____

*A representative must submit an affidavit or power of attorney signed by the property owner of record authorizing the representation.

APPLICATION SUBMITTAL ITEMS:

The following submittal materials must be submitted in full before the application will be deemed complete (please check all items that are being submitted):

- ☒ Applicable fees and deposits.
- ☒ Project Narrative, describing the project, its compliance with any applicable review criteria, any impacts to the surrounding area, and any other relevant information.
- ☒ Surrounding and interested Property Ownership Report (see project specific checklist for more information).
- ☒ Proof of Ownership (ownership & encumbrance report) for subject property.
- ☒ Site Plan, drawn to scale and depicting the locations and boundaries of existing and proposed lots and structures.
- ☒ Project specific checklist.

FEES AND DEPOSITS:

See Eagle Municipal Code Section 4.03.080

1. Application fees shall be paid in full at the time of the filing of the application and unless paid, the application shall not be deemed complete. All fees are nonrefundable.
2. As described in Eagle Municipal Code § 4.03.080, third-party consultants may be necessary for the review and processing of applications. These costs ("pass-through costs") must be paid by the applicant. If pass-through costs are expected, the applicant must pay a deposit at the time the application is filed. If at any time the deposit does not fully cover the pass-through costs, the applicant must pay another subsequent deposit before the Town will continue processing the application.
3. The Town may withhold the recording of any Subdivision Final Plat or Development Plan or the signing of any Resolution or Ordinance until all pass-through fees are paid in full.
4. Within 30 days of approval or denial of an application, any remaining deposit shall be returned to the applicant. If an application is withdrawn, any remaining deposit shall be returned to the applicant within 60 days.

I have read the application form and certify that the information contained herein is correct and accurate to the best of my knowledge. I understand that it is my responsibility to provide the Town with accurate information related to this application. I UNDERSTAND THAT FILING AN APPLICATION IS NOT A GUARANTEE THAT THE APPLICATION WILL BE APPROVED.

Signature

William Bueff

Date

1/6/2020

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY			
DATE RECEIVED _____	BY _____	FILE NUMBER _____	
REVIEW FEE _____	DATE PAID _____	RECEIVED BY _____	
DATE CERTIFIED COMPLETE _____	BY _____		
P&Z HEARING DATE _____	DECISION _____		
BOT HEARING DATE _____	DECISION _____		



TOWN OF EAGLE
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
200 BROADWAY • PO BOX 609 • EAGLE, CO 81631
PHONE: 970-328-9655 • FAX: 970-328-9656
www.townofeagle.org

REZONING SUBMITTAL CHECKLIST

Pursuant to the Land Use & Development Code, Section 4.05.030(B)

- ☒ Cover letter that provides a description of the proposal.
- ☒ Proof of Ownership (owner & encumbrance report) for subject property
**If applicant is not the property owner, notarized consent of the property owner is required.*
- ☒ Site Plan
**Site plan shall be drawn to scale and depict the locations and boundaries of existing and proposed lots and/or structures.*
- ☒ A petition requesting the zoning change, signed by owners of at least 50% of the land area proposed for rezoning.
- ☒ Names and addresses of owners of record (not lessees) within 250' excluding rights of way, submitted either printed on mailing labels or as an Excel spreadsheet.
- ☒ Rezoning Fee

Annexation and Zoning Request

Overview of Project

Existing Conditions

The property has been in continuous ownership by William and Nancy Powell since 1979 and initially consisted of a single parcel of 9.25 acres. In 1983 a PUD zoning and final plat were approved by Eagle County which divided the property into two residential lots, creating an overall density of five units, and a dedicated right of way for Violet Lane. Four apartment units exist on Lot 1; one single family unit exists on Lot 2. The property is currently served by the following services: wastewater, electric, phone and cable. Natural gas is not present on the site. Currently the five units are provided domestic water from an adjudicated well source. The town recently constructed a waterline main extension to the Lower Basin Water Plant, which passes through Lot 2 on a dedicated easement and adjacent to Lot 1 (within Violet Lane). Refuse service includes comingle recycle and household trash.

Intent of Annexation and Zoning Requests

The intent of the Powell Park request is to add modest density to the overall project area. Applicants are concurrently applying for annexation and a zoning request for Residential Medium (RM) density for both Lots 1 and 2. Providing domestic water from the town will make the proposal viable. For Lot 1 the intent is to raze the four unit apartment building. The RM zoning for Lot 1 will allow flexibility for construction of multifamily units or single family lots or a combination of both. For Lot 2 the existing home will remain and no increase density is proposed at this time. Access for both lots is from Violet Lane which has a public crossing across the inoperative railroad tracks and connecting to the Sylvan Lake roundabout. Irrigation will be provided from existing non potable, adjudicated water sources on the property. No development will be allowed on the lower bench, to be memorialized with the Final Plat. Fishing access on owner lands will be made legal, also designated on the Final Plat.

Community Plan-Vision

The Powell Park proposal embodies many of the principals of the Vision for the Community Plan. The proposals will further concentrate infill development with significant open space. The project area is adjacent to the Eagle Valley Trail, and near east and west bound ECO Transit bus stops. The project permanently conserves over 50% of the property in open space for land that is environmentally sensitive and has wildlife habitat. With the upcoming Final plat application the applicant will enhance recreational opportunities by voluntarily proposing appropriate public fishing access on the Eagle River. Public services will be conservation oriented-see Utility Section below. If built, condominiums or apartments are expected to be in the affordable range and add to the attainable housing stock. All units proposed will have a high livability factor because of the semi-rural nature of the property, with protection of open space, and excellent viewsheds.

Conformance with Community Plan-Future land Use Map--Intent

The proposed project is in Conformance with the Future Land Use Map, particularly as it relates to Conservation Oriented Neighborhoods and Open Space sub-chapters. See following adherence to provisions.

- A. Development over and above that allowed by existing zoning on properties with this designation predicated on annexation to the Town of Eagle.

B. Balance conservation and development objectives.

C. Preserve attributes of high conservation value as determined practicable and appropriate on site by site basis. Attributes of high conservation value include, but are not limited to stream and river corridors, wetlands and riparian areas, viewsheds, wildlife habitat and movement corridors, significant, unique or endangered vegetation, historic sites or structures, productive agricultural lands steep slopes and geologic hazard area

Conformance with Community Plan—Future Land Use Map—Character

- A. Development is clustered, providing walkable neighborhoods, functional and interconnected open spaces and easily accessed public facilities.
- B. Developed areas are compact and well connected with multimodal road, path and trail systems, and public transit.

Conformance with Community Plan--Future Land Use Map-Location Criteria

- 1. Located in areas that can be efficiently served by town infrastructure, within reasonable proximity to public services, job centers and shopping, where environmentally or aesthetically valuable lands also exist.

Conformance with Eagle River Corridor Plan

The Powell Park submittal is in conformance with the ERCP in that it concentrates development on the upper bench, precludes any development on the lower bench, and makes legal fishing access on applicant owned lands within the Eagle River. The lower bench will be retained for the “preservation of ecologically sensitive lands and wildlife habitat.” The ERCP designates the zoning for the upper bench to be Medium Density Residential, which the applicant intends to follow.

Water Rights

The property has five adjudicated springs, 1.2 acre feet of adjudicated pond storage and an adjudicated well. The springs and pond provide source water to irrigate all areas of the property. The practice currently exists and is planned for the future. The water rights are protected from the Historic User Pool located at the Green Mountain Reservoir.

Utility Services-Existing

The property is currently provided all utility services except domestic water and natural gas. All outside irrigation is non-potable and provided from on-site adjudicated sources. The property is currently on town wastewater service. The apartment building has electric heat. The home on Lot 2 is heated with LPG. All other shallow utilities are present.

Utility Services-Proposed

Future in-house domestic water will be provided from the town system. Holy Cross Energy has power lines on the property and additional service is easily provided. Wastewater, telephone and cable services are within the Violet Lane right of way. It is not proposed that natural gas be brought to the property.

Conservation Efficiency

The condominiums or apartments or single family units proposed for Lot 1 will be heated by electricity. Additionally the domestic water will be very non-consumptive because source water is from the LBWTP and discharge from the nearby Wastewater Plant; and all outside irrigation is provided non-potably.

Zoning

Zoning for both Lots is proposed for Residential Medium density (RM). Applicant seeks to have traditional zoning to allow flexibility for both multi-family and single family uses. Applicant is currently evaluating the most appropriate residential uses on Lot 1.

List of Exhibits

1. Proof of ownership
2. Site Plans
3. Application for zone change
4. Names and addresses of ownership within 250'


Exhibit B

PETITION FOR REZONING POWELL PARK SUBDIVISION


William and Nancy Powell, Trustees of the Powell Family Trust and 100% owners of the property, do hereby petition the Town of Eagle to rezone the Powell Park Subdivision to the Residential Medium Zone District.

Petitioners assert the following conditions are met for rezoning the property

1. That the rezoning is compatible with surrounding land uses, and is consistent with the Town's goals, policies and plans;
2. The existing zoning is inconsistent with the Town's goals, policies and plans;
3. That the area for which the rezoning is requested has changed substantially such the proposed rezoning better meets the needs of the community.



William Powell



Nancy Powell

B.

Exhibit D





Exhibit E





Walkability & 1/4 Mile Buffer

The average adult walks 3.0 to 4.0 feet per second, or 2.05 to 2.73 mph. Transportation planners use 4.0 feet per second as the amount of time pedestrians need to cross a street. However, children, seniors, and people with disabilities may walk only 2.0 or 2.5 feet per second. There is a possibility that the standard may be reduced to 3.5 feet per second, in recognition of the overall aging of the population.

The speed at which people walk is the critical measure that helps define the size of a walkable community or neighborhood. Most residents typically walk to destinations that are within five minutes of their homes (Untermyer, 1984). If the distance is greater, people with access to an automobile are more likely to use it, unless there are constraints on driving such as traffic congestion, limited parking, or parking charges, for example. At 3.0 feet per second, a person can walk from 1/6 to 1/3 of a mile in 5 to 10 minutes. At 4.0 feet per second, a person can reach a destination of 1/4 mile in 5.5 minutes.

Source: Planning and Urban Design Standards, 2007



CHAPTER 2: Future Land Use



MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MDR)

INTENT

The Medium-Density Residential (MDR) designation envisions a node of residential development on the higher, flatter land adjacent to the Sylvan Lake Road roundabout. Development in this area should be designed to avoid impact to the wetlands, riparian vegetation and pond in the eastern portion of the MDR area.

Located at the western entrance to the Town of Eagle, residential development in the MDR area should be designed to be both interesting and inviting. Development should contribute to the creation of an attractive western gateway to the town. The building pattern should be varied in order to avoid the impression of a wall along either Grand Avenue or the Eagle River.

The MDR area will be connected to the Eagle Valley Trail, Eagle Ranch trail system and the trail system that meanders through the Eagle County Fairgrounds. Residents will benefit from convenient access to Sylvan Lake Road, Grand Avenue and the ECO Transit bus stop along Grand Avenue. This transit stop offers bus service to Gypsum, as well as bus service to the regional transit stop along Eby Creek Road.

LAND USE

Single-family homes, duplexes, and multi-family residential development are appropriate in the MDR area. Residential development should be arranged to minimize adverse impacts on lands with high environmental value and important wildlife habitat.

Residential densities in the MDR area should be approximately 10-12 dwelling units per acre. This is density similar to areas adjacent to the Eagle Ranch Neighborhood Center including the Gamble Street Townhomes, West Village Condos, and duplexes along Founders Avenue.

MOBILITY

Vehicular - The MDR area is currently accessed from Grand Avenue via the Sylvan Lake Road roundabout and Violet Lane. Violet Lane crosses the railroad, and increased development in this area may require improvements to the existing railroad crossing. If crossing improvements are necessary, they will require approval from the Public Utility Commission (PUC) and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR). The town will assist in this process.

Eagle County has prepared a conceptual plan for a secondary vehicular access to the Eagle County Fairgrounds. The proposed alignment is from Violet Lane, north across the Eagle River, tying into Fairgrounds Road. The general location across the Eagle River is shown on the Concept Plan (see page 10). Development in the MDR area should be coordinated with Eagle County to accommodate the future construction of this road.

Trails - The Eagle Valley Trail runs along the south side of the MDR area. This section of the Eagle Valley Trail connects Gypsum (to the west) with Brooks Lane/5th Street (to the east). With construction of the new segments of the Eagle Valley Trail depicted in this plan, the MDR area will be connected to the Eagle County Fairgrounds, the Recreation Core and the TOMU area.

This plan envisions construction of a paved trail that will connect the existing Eagle Ranch trail system to the Eagle County Fairgrounds trail system (see the Open Space & Trails Plan on page 29). Connection of this paved trail between the Brush Creek Confluence Open Space and the Fairgrounds will require construction of a new pedestrian bridge over the Eagle River.

PUBLIC SPACE

The Brush Creek Confluence Open Space is located along the western side of the MDR area and provides opportunities for passive recreation. Previously used as an auto salvage yard, this land has been re-vegetated with native grasses and improved with the installation of a split rail fence and gravel parking lot. This plan



Creating an Activity Node around the Sylvan Lake Roundabout

The MDR designation envisions a node of residential development around the Sylvan Lake Road roundabout. More intensive residential development in West Eagle has the potential to catalyze additional redevelopment.



STAFF REPORT AND CERTIFICATE OF RECOMMENDATION

TO: Planning & Zoning Commission

FROM: Community Development Department

DATE: March 2, 2021

FILE NUMBER: PUDA20-01

PROJECT: Haymeadow PUD Amendment

REQUEST: Two requests for a major Planned Unit Development (PUD) amendment within the Haymeadow development. 1) Request to swap the School Land portion of Tract E with multi-family development and to allocate a different parcel for a future school site. 2) Request to renovate an existing cabin currently located in open space to the East of Neighborhood D as an event space and to swap this open space parcel with land equal in size and desirability.

APPLICANT: Rick Pylman, Pylman & Associates, Inc.
Scott Schlosser, Owner's Representative
Brandon Cohen, Abrika Properties, LLC

LOCATION: 660 acres south and east of Sylvan Lake Rd and Brush Creek Rd

CODE: Section 4.11.040 – PUD Review Procedures
Section 4.11.050 – Amendments to planned unit development zoning and development plans.
Chapter 4.06 – Development Review
Chapter 4.07 – Development Standards

ZONING: PUD Zone District

EXHIBITS:

- A: Project Narrative including Site Plans, Conceptual Plans and Development Impact Report
- B: Redlined PUD Guide
- C: McDowell Engineering Traffic Memo dated October 16, 2020
- D: Aerials / GIS
- E: Public Comment Summary and Letters
- F: [Fox Tuttle Traffic Impact Study dated August 14, 2013 {LINK}](#)
- G: Town Engineer Letter of Outstanding Concerns dated

PUBLIC COMMENT: Staff has received 81 letters of public comment as of February 26, 2021. A summary of the comments received is attached as Exhibit E, and all letters are attached to the summary. Letters received after

this time will be gathered and entered into the public record at the hearing.

STAFF: Jessica Lake, Planner I – jessica.lake@townofeagle.org

INTRODUCTION

There are two requests in this PUD Amendment and both are considered to be “major” amendments to the PUD Guide. The first is a request to swap the School Land portion of Tract E with multi-family housing from Neighborhoods B and C. 112 dwelling units are proposed to be removed from Neighborhoods B and C and added to Tract E. The second is a request to renovate an existing cabin, currently located in open space to the East of Neighborhood D, as an event space and to swap this open space parcel with land equal in size and desirability. Each request should be evaluated on its own merits in regard to Section 4.11.050 of the Municipal Code and voted on separately.

The Haymeadow property was annexed, zoned PUD, and preliminarily platted in 2014. The property is roughly 660 acres in size extending south and east from the current intersection of Brush Creek Road and Sylvan Lake Road. Since the original 2014 approvals, the Annexation and Development Agreement has been amended twice, the Final Plat for Filing 1 has been approved, as has an amendment to that plat to address discrepancies in the platted easements.

The PUD Guide sets out densities for the five different neighborhoods within the 660-acre area of land. In 2014, 837 total dwelling units were approved, of that total, 344 are designated as multi-family housing and 493 are single family or duplex units. The PUD Guide does allow for some limited swapping of densities between single family/duplex and multi-family and between neighborhoods. The multi-family units are able to be anything from small condos units in a two or three story building to larger-scale townhomes, allowing for greater flexibility based on market conditions. Design Guidelines for the Haymeadow property will be submitted to the Town via the Major Development Permit process; this will be the Town’s opportunity to review designs for both multi-family and single family/duplex construction. Once the Design Guidelines are approved, the Haymeadow Metropolitan District and eventually the Haymeadow Design Review Board will be responsible for enforcing those guidelines. The Town will continue to have enforcement responsibility for only the regulations contained in the PUD Guide.

In 2013 a Traffic Impact Study was put together by Fox Tuttle Transportation Group, LLC. This study looked at the Town as a whole to address the impact that the development of the Haymeadow property would put on existing streets throughout Eagle. There is not an in-depth analysis regarding the internal streets and flow of circulation internal to the Haymeadow Development. This study is attached to this report via a link, for those who would like to review in full.

McDowell Engineering has submitted an updated Traffic Memo included with this application. This memo is discussed in greater detail below, but generally found that “a comparison of the sites to be swapped results in a net increase of daily trips for Neighborhood A... peak morning hourly trips are anticipated to be higher at the new school site.”

Since the original approvals for this project, Eagle has seen many changes. Many new guiding policies have been adopted, including the 2020 Comprehensive Plan, the 2020 Haymaker Trailhead

Master Plan, the 2020 Strategic Plan, the 2020 Water Efficiency & Conservation Plan, and the 2018 Eagle Valley Housing Needs and Solutions, just to mention a few.

This application was submitted to Town Staff prior to the adoption of the 2020 Comprehensive Plan and therefore only references the 2010 Eagle Area Community Plan. Staff has reviewed the Eagle Area Community Plan against this application for overall plan compliance, a summary of that review can be found below.

In review of this application, staff has solicited feedback from Public Works and Engineering, the Building Department, ToE Open Space, Greater Eagle Fire District, Eagle County School District, Mountain Recreation, Eagle County Community Development, Eagle County Environmental Health, and Colorado Parks & Wildlife. Outstanding concerns from these agencies have been incorporated into staff's review, and when appropriate, as a condition of approval or as the basis for a recommendation.

ISSUES FOR DISCUSSION

1. Condition #1 of the standards speaks to efficient development and preservation of the entire planned unit development. Is the school swap request efficient development? Is the cabin renovation efficient development?
2. Condition #2 speaks to the enjoyment of land and the public interest. Does the school swap substantially diminish the enjoyment of land and/or the public interest? Does the use of the cabin substantially diminish the enjoyment of land and/or the public interest?
3. Condition #4 requires that the amendment not contain uses that detract from other uses approved in the PUD. Does relocating the school portion away from the school and rec parcel detract from the use of that parcel? Does renovating the cabin into an events venue detract from the Haymaker trail uses?
4. Is general plan compliance with the 2010 Eagle Area Community Plan achieved with both the school swap request and the cabin renovation request?

CONDITIONS FOR AMENDMENTS TO PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS

SECTION 4.11.050.A.1-6:

CONDITION #1: *The proposed amendment is consistent with the efficient development and preservation of the entire planned unit development.*

Staff Comment – School Swap: The school swap request is partially consistent with the clustering of housing towards more developed areas of land encouraged by the 2010 Eagle Area Community Plan (EACP), except that clustering is primarily encouraged in and around established commercial centers. The initial plan distributed multi-family housing throughout the PUD and into Neighborhoods A1, A2, B, and C. The amendment allows for housing stock to be built and enter the market sooner in the project phasing, but restricts all multi-family housing to only Neighborhoods A1 and A2, with the expansion of A1 by 14.2 acres.

In terms of the school sites and they each may affect internal traffic flows; there are likely advantages and disadvantages to each location and it's difficult to quantify or qualify the school

in terms of efficient development. The infrastructure including, access (streets), water, wastewater, shallow utilities; are in place in Tract E; but would likely not be tapped into by the school for several years at least. Should the school property remain as-is, the land will need to be irrigated until such time the school develops the property. The proposed school location does provide good access for both families internal to the Haymeadow development and those who live in the southern portion of Eagle Ranch. The existing school location is also a convenient access point for those internal to Haymeadow, as well as for those coming from southern Eagle Ranch. The developer has agreed to make some improvements for pedestrian crossings on Brush Creek Road at the time of construction of the Ouzel Lane Trail as outlined in the Town's approved trails plan. The existing school location is more convenient from other neighborhoods, such as Soleil, Brush Creek Townhomes, the Orchard the Terrace, and the northern portion of Eagle Ranch. The applicant makes the argument that on the new proposed location the school parking lot can still act as overflow parking for events and recreation, and it has the added benefit of dispersing some of that parking. Staff agrees that this is a valid argument to be made, but it comes down to preference and priorities. A priority might be to see a combined school and recreation facility that allows for students to safely access recreation amenities that might otherwise be a car ride with their parents away. Another priority might be to see more affordable housing available to Eagle residents and others who want to move to Eagle. Another priority might be to ensure that traffic circulation flows as well as possible throughout existing and new developments. These are all goals of the Eagle Area Community Plan and they need to be weighed against this request and determined where they are in alignment and where they aren't and then weighted based on the vision for Eagle.

The use of a "shared campus" between the Recreation District and the School District was noted as being an example of efficient development in the approved PUD. The ability for students to walk to recreation from the School, sharing playgrounds and fields, sharing parking between not only the rec center and school but also for events, expanded after school opportunities and programs are all benefits of having one parcel for both the Rec District and the School District. The proposed swap does allow for much needed housing to be built more quickly, utilizing existing infrastructure and not needing to irrigate a large parcel until it is eventually developed. Both the original and proposed plans can be argued to fit in with efficient development, but which plan fits best with the overall vision for Eagle?

Staff Comment – Cabin: The location of the Cabin poses a challenge in that is very far out on the property. If efficient development of the PUD is to phase from Neighborhood A1 to A2 to B and so on, then technically the cabin likely wouldn't be developed for many years to come. In order to develop the cabin into an events space sooner, the applicant is proposing to utilize the existing septic and well system previously used by the Adam's Rib Ranch. The applicant is prepared to spend the money necessary to get both the cabin, the grounds and the well and septic up to current standards, but this does mean that it is likely to be many years before it is connected to Town water and sewer. The applicant has also stated that most, if not all, events at the cabin will be utilizing supplemental portable sanitation facilities to reduce usage on the well and septic. The Town's Public Works and Engineering department has reviewed the application and had some concerns regarding utility usage, timing for connecting to Municipal water and sewer, fire protection, non-potable water for irrigation, etc. Public Works still has some outstanding concerns regarding timing and triggers for connection to Town water and sewer for the cabin. Public Works has requested a date certain for connection, with the ability to apply for an

administrative extension if that date turns out not to be feasible. The applicant has stated that a “date certain” is not an option for them and they have included a trigger to connect the cabin to infrastructure when infrastructure is brought into Neighborhood D. Planning staff suggests the following as a Condition of Approval: when water and wastewater lines are within 400’ of the Cabin property, on-site water and wastewater shall be required to hook-up within two (2) years.

CONDITION #2: *The proposed amendment does not affect in a substantially adverse manner either the enjoyment of land abutting upon, adjoining or across a street from the planned unit development or the public interest.*

Staff Comment – School Swap: Residents in the Soleil Development and other neighborhoods in Eagle have sent in public comment letters noting their thoughts on the proposed school land swap. In the original approvals, the lower portion of Tract E was slated for development as a school (likely to be K-8). Use of Tract E as a school does confine high usage times to primarily week daytime hours and would not be heavily used during the summer months. The upper portion of Tract E has been master planned by Mountain Recreation. Mountain Rec did include parking lots on the plan that were planned to be shared use between the Rec District and the School District. A housing development on Tract E, would likely have higher usage in the evening hours and on weekends year round; similar to the high demand hours for Mountain Rec. The residents in a housing development on Tract E would have great walkable access to the Mountain Rec facilities, as will residents in the existing Neighborhood A1. Mountain Recreation’s master plan is moving forward into the fundraising period and this decision does have an affect on them. Mountain Rec commented that the *EACP recognizes the ‘shared use of school facilities has contributed positively to the Eagle Community’ and encourages shared use practices to continue and expand. As well, the factors of livability include maintain the area’s ‘sense of community’, maintaining and enhancing recreational opportunities, and providing infrastructure and public services efficiently and equitably. For quite some time, the Town and its residents have considered the subject area to be valuable as a trailhead and recreation campus, serving as a central social and recreational hub for the community now and even more so once the Town is fully built out. This community ‘heart’ has been purposefully planned to include an appropriately sized space for recreational and school purposes, which create specific efficiencies for community use of public land. Preserving and protecting this area for its intended use will offer greater opportunity to provide a ‘sense of community’ than would be possible if the proposed amendment were approved. Shared school/recreation use of the parcel, and its adjacent park land tract, offers Eagle County Schools and Mountain Recreation access to the entirety of both parcels plus access to existing adjacent school and recreation amenities rather than relegating the agencies to segregated properties. Swapping the school site would impact the recreational use of the property by the Town of Eagle and Mountain Recreation, reducing the scale and impact of public services otherwise possible under the existing Haymeadow PUD. To further illustrate the loss in public service efficiency, the site proposed for the future school is approximately one mile from the currently approved location. Relocation to an outlying neighborhood may create a need to bus students to utilize recreation facilities during school hours, increasing the cost of offering students unique physical education and curricular opportunities. The distance created by the swap also makes access to extracurricular or recreation-based before and after school programs held in recreation facilities that provide pro-social, physical, emotional, and mental*

health support an unnecessary logistical challenge. It can and has been argued by many of the Soleil homeowners, Mountain Recreation and other community members that this swap does affect them in a substantially adverse manner. The developer has proposed a buffer between the Neighborhood they hope to build and the Soleil homeowners, however the homeowners would prefer to see the plan remain as it is. It comes down to the vision and priorities again.

Staff Comment – Cabin: The cabin is located on a portion of land that lies within a loop of the Haymaker mountain bike trail. The developer has proposed to relocate a portion of the Haymaker trail to minimize any conflict within the area utilized by the cabin. Signage and markers are proposed at the intersection of the trail and the road. Most larger events at the cabin will include shuttle service to and from area hotels, churches, etc., which should cut down on the number of cars parked in the proposed parking area. This parking area will not be available for trail parking, but strictly for those using the cabin. Current users of the Haymaker trail do need to cross the existing dirt road that runs to the cabin, from this standpoint not much will change, except that the road will be more frequently used during remodel of the cabin and lands and as an events space. The applicant has agreed to work with the Town’s Open Space and Trails manager to determine the best way to re-route one portion of the trail, as well as on signage, trail construction, etc. and staff has included conditions of approval for these items.

CONDITION #3: *The proposed amendment is not granted solely to confer a special benefit upon any person.*

Staff Comment – School Swap: The proposed school swap does have benefits for the developer. Approval of this request would enable the developer to utilize the infrastructure earlier, as well as sell product earlier. There also may be benefits to the community: housing stock is available sooner, which helps Eagle to better meet demands. The School District (ECSD) has looked at this swap and believes that the greater land size of the proposed parcel is a benefit to them. The ECSD says: *While both the existing and proposed school dedications are viable school sites, the proposed site is preferred due primarily to its size and location.* As this swap could benefit the developer, the ECSD, and that portion of the community looking for more immediate housing; staff suggests that the proposed amendment does not confer a special benefit upon any person.

Staff Comment – Cabin: Converting the cabin into an events space also has benefits to the developer. To be able to utilize a space that has been vacant for many years and revitalize it will provide a pecuniary benefit to the developer (after a substantial amount of money has been spent on those renovations). There is also an economic benefit to businesses in Eagle who are in the special events industry. Activating this space as an events venue likely will generate added business for small local businesses. Therefore, this request does not confer a special benefit solely upon any person.

CONDITION #4: *The proposed amendment does not contain proposed uses that detract from other uses approved in the PUD.*

Staff Comment – School Swap: Both a school site and multi-family housing were approved uses under the original PUD zoning. Swapping locations does not seem to directly detract from other uses approved in the PUD. Mountain Recreation has made an argument for how the proposed change in use may detract from the Rec District’s plans. *The intensive community engagement process (Mountain Rec’s master conceptual plans) included an exploration of the ways in which*

the school/recreation parcel could be planned to include the school, shared parking, and shared multi-purpose field spaces. The conceptual plans developed and approved were based on a school being located adjacent to the existing parkland. Changes to the location of the school may result in a need to revise plans for both parcels. Eagle Pool and Ice Rink expansion efforts, which are already under way, may be jeopardized should plans need to be revised because of the land swap. Furthermore, proximal placement of multi-family residences on the parcel proposed may create additional traffic and safety issues. Peak time use of recreation facilities, trails and parking is evenings and weekends, which is generally the same as peak parking times for housing developments. The Haymaker trailhead concept plan addressed parking concerns with the sharing of school and recreation parking for ordinary use since school parking demands complement recreation parking demands. The plan also included a planned overflow parking area for use during seasonal special events. Sharing parking with multi-family housing is not feasible. As well, parking needs for the housing development may adversely impact the recreation parcels, which already see residential overnight parking from adjacent neighborhoods. Moving the location of the school is also a potential detraction for families who may have been anticipating the amenities offered by a shared recreation/school site in Eagle. It is unlikely that adding multi-family housing to this area detracts from the use, although it does result in a much more consolidated area of multi-family housing. The primary possible detraction when looking at this amendment is the relocation of the school site away from the Recreation District site.

Staff Comment – Cabin: Swapping the Open Space land that the cabin sits on with developable land in Neighborhood D allows the development to maintain the full amount of open space as originally dedicated. This does mean that a section of the Haymaker Trail will be on private land rather than in public open space. It is possible that the use of the cabin as an events space will occasionally conflict with trail users. It is not possible to predict if or when conflict might arise, however to address conflict if it does arise, staff suggests that the applicant provide some direction as to how disputes would be handled, and has added a Condition of Approval.

CONDITION #5: *The proposed amendment does not contain an open space plan that differs substantially in quantity or quality from that originally approved.*

Staff Comment – School Swap: The school swap request does not affect the approved open space plan for the development. Should this request be approved, the applicant has agreed to create a landscape buffer to provide a visual boundary and a “landscaped open space” area resulting in 2.6 acres between the Soleil Development and multi-family housing. This portion of open space would not be part of the open space plan but would be part of the landscape portion of the Design Guidelines. Staff believes that the proposed amendment does not contain an open space plan that differs substantially in quantity or quality from that originally approved.

Staff Comment – Cabin: The cabin request would create a 5.8-acre parcel (Tract I) around the cabin from land that is projected to be deeded to the Town as open space. To maintain the same acreage of open space in the PUD, 5.8 acres of natural land would be subtracted from the northern portion of Neighborhood D and designated as open space. The additional open space in this area will offer a larger buffer between the Haymaker trail and Neighborhood D for trail users while also benefiting wildlife by providing a larger wildlife corridor.

The Haymeadow developers have also requested a small reroute of the Haymaker Trail near the cabin to separate the trail experience from the event venue. The developers will be responsible for the costs and construction of the reroute, with the Town retaining final approval of the new alignment. The final plat for Tract I will include a new trail easement protecting access for the trail through the parcel. Further, with the proposed PUD Amendment, the Town would no longer be responsible for taking over an existing events venue and trying to run a business as a local government entity. The Open Space Manager has reviewed the application and believes the land proposed in the open space swap is substantially similar or better in quantity and quality to what was originally approved. A suggested Condition of Approval has also been added for the proposed Open Space tract to include the Extra Credit trail, which would allow the Town to make this a permanent extension of the Haymaker Trail.

CONDITION #6: *The proposed amendment contains street and utility plans that are coordinated with planned and/or existing streets and utilities for the remainder of the PUD.*

Staff Comment – School Swap: The proposed school swap does not include any alterations to the approved internal street plan. The 2013 Fox Tuttle Traffic Report notes: *It is anticipated that the traffic accessing the new recreation facilities will use the existing roadways that access the ice rink. There will be a narrow and circuitous connection between the recreation site and the school site, but it is not expected that there will be any through traffic from one parking area to the other. However, this connection will provide a secondary emergency access route to both facilities.* The existing location for the school and recreation parcel does have the benefit of a secondary emergency access point. In terms of primary access points both the existing school location and the proposed alternative school land locations are located on corner parcels with roundabouts planned at those intersections. The existing school site would place greater demand on the extension of Sylvan Lake Road internal to the Haymeadow development. The proposed school site places a greater demand on roads primarily external to the development – Brush Creek Road and Ouzel Lane. Due to the greater potential for demand to Brush Creek Road and Ouzel Lane, a condition of approval has been added requesting the developer to provide analysis of impacts to this area prior to a Final Plat application for the proposed school site (Tract J).

It is anticipated by Public Works that multi-family housing will require greater demands on water and sewer than a school would. Water modeling has not been provided by the applicant at this time, staff is requesting a continuance of the School Swap request in order to have time to receive and review a water study. As previously noted in this report, internal traffic patterns and flows for the Haymeadow development were not a primary focus of the 2013 Traffic Study, staff would like to see data on internal projected trips and how the swap may affect these prior to making a recommendation to the Planning & Zoning Commission.

Staff Comment – Cabin: An existing dirt road currently leads to the cabin, situated just east of Neighborhood D. On the site plan, the road is shown only as existing but not to remain. When Neighborhood D is platted, the applicant and the development team will need to show how access will be maintained, but as the Neighborhood is not yet platted, staff does not have concerns about the cabin as it relates to coordination with the overall street and utility plans.

ANALYSIS OF DEVELOPMENT IMPACT REPORT

SECTION 4.07.100:

C. Development impact report requirements.

1. *For each area under Subsection (B) of this section for which the response is "will" or "could possibly," a development impact report addressing such concern may be requested by the Town Planner before development review by the Planning Commission or may be required by the Commission or Town Board at any time prior to final approval. In addition, a public facilities impact statement may be required in accordance with the provisions of [Chapter 4.14](#).*
2. *The development impact report shall include technical studies, data, conclusions, summaries, and recommendations, performed by qualified professionals and at a level of detail commensurate with the potential impact of the development. The content, form, preparers and detail shall be adequate to enable the Town staff, Planning Commission and Town Board to Judge the impact of the proposal and the adequacy of the proposed mitigating measures, and shall be subject to approval of the Town Manager.*
3. *The development impact report shall describe temporary and long-term impacts of the project, both primary and secondary, beneficial and detrimental. The report shall include assessment of the following:*
 - a. Adverse effects which cannot be avoided if the proposal is implemented.*
 - b. Mitigating measures proposed to minimize the impact.*
 - c. Cumulative and long-term effects of the proposal, which either significantly reduce or enhance the state of the environment.*
 - d. Possible alternatives to the proposed action.*
 - e. Irreversible environmental changes resulting from implementation of the proposal.*
 - f. Population and economic impacts of the proposal.*

Staff Comment – School Swap: Staff has reviewed the applicant’s responses to the development impact report and has only one concern regarding the proposed school swap. This application could alter local traffic patterns, and a trip distribution analysis by McDowell Engineering was included to provide further analysis. However, the intersection of Brush Creek Road and Ouzel Lane will likely require further analysis, McDowell Engineering suggests studying this intersection prior to final plat. Staff would have preferred to see this study provided in the traffic memo rather than approving a request without fully understanding the potential impacts. Staff suggests a condition of approval to address this concern. As mentioned above, staff does have concerns about impacts to traffic internal to the Haymeadow development and has requested a continuance in order to both receive and review this information.

Staff Comment – Cabin: Staff has reviewed the applicant’s responses to the development impact report as they regard the cabin and events, as has Colorado Parks and Wildlife. Comments from CPW have been incorporated into the application and PUD Guide and it appears that all concerns have been adequately addressed. However, CPW has not provided any final comments as of February 25th.

ANALYSIS OF 2010 EAGLE AREA COMMUNITY PLAN

Staff Comment: While compliance with the approved plans and policies are not a specific Condition in Title 4 of the Municipal Code, it is relevant to Conditions 1-6 as identified above. As stated in the Introduction, this application falls under the 2010 Eagle Area Community Plan and not the 2020 Elevate Eagle Comprehensive Plan because the application was submitted prior to the final adoption of the 2020 plan. Since the original Haymeadow PUD 2010 plan was

deemed in compliance with the 2010 plan, this review will focus only on the change in uses and locations presented.

Planning Principles: Brush Creek Character Area. A. Within the Urban Growth Boundary, locate new development close to existing development of similar intensity. Encourage clustering to balance conservation and development objectives so that wildlife habitat, views and sensitive environmental areas are preserved. **Staff Comment: While the proposal would not increase the number of multi-family units in the Haymeadow project, this proposal would focus more of them into Neighborhood A1 and the result would be no multi-family dwellings in neighborhoods B, C, or D. (note that no multi-family dwellings were approved in D). No multi-family dwellings currently exist in this area.**

Land Use Policy 2.2 New development should be compact, pedestrian friendly and located within or adjacent to existing development to minimize infrastructure and service needs. **Staff Comment: The resulting multi-family would be compact and adjacent to existing development.**

Land Use Policy 3.1.B. Design road, parking and delivery systems to anticipate future development and transportation needs. Promote a land use pattern that minimizes travel distances and encourages mobility by means other than the personal automobile. AND

Natural Resources Policy 1.2. B. Encourage site designs and alternative transit incentives that reduce the demand for automobile trips in the area. **Staff Comment: While placing more dwellings within walking distance to the recreation facilities at the Pool and Ice Rink would encourage more pedestrian trips, moving the school away from the existing neighborhoods could result in more vehicle trips.**

Transportation Policy 1.2.B. Require development applicants to provide traffic studies and traffic impact analysis appropriate to the location, scale and nature of proposed improvements. **Staff Comment: The TOE Public Works Department commented that the Traffic Memorandum submitted as part of the application requires additional information.**

Transportation Policy 1.2. G. Locate high traffic generating land uses close to collector and arterial roadways and transit centers. **Staff Comment: Both the existing and proposed locations share similar distances to Brush Creek Road and the extension of Sylvan Lake Road through the development.**

Community Design Policy 1.1.F. Retain and showcase existing design elements that contribute to the heritage and sense of place of the community and encourage new design to reflect such forms and materials, particularly within the Town Center Character Area. **Staff Comment: With the cabin's conversion to a private special event venue, the views from the facility would provide guests with not only great views of the Eagle area, but would further Town branding as a community that focuses on the outdoor lifestyle.**

Community Design Policy 1.3.D. Promote community events and festivals, including but not limited to Flight Days, Christmas on Broadway, 12th Night, 4th of July fireworks, Show Downtown Concerts, recreation district activities and the Eagle County Fair and Rodeo. **Staff Comment: While not necessarily providing events such as those mentioned, this approval would add another event facility to the town – in a location that is presently rural.**

Economic Development Policy 1.1.I. Attract viable businesses and trades specifically for Eagle and/or potential local niche markets. **Staff Comment: Presently, facilities such as wedding venues are considered niche in the Town.**

Economic Development Policy 1.2.A. Support opportunities to expand the number and diversity of businesses in Eagle. **Staff Comment: The approval would result in a new business in Eagle.**

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends CONTINUANCE (tabling) of file PUDA20-01, a major PUD amendment request to swap the School Land portion of Tract E with multi-family development and to allocate a different parcel for a future school site, until April 6, 2021 based on the following items that are still needed for staff to make a recommendation to the Planning & Zoning Commission:

1. Update to the original traffic study (2013) and the traffic memo (2020) to reflect the current predictions for comparing internal pedestrian, bicycle, vehicle, and bus trips between the existing and proposed relocated school site. The traffic analysis should account for drop-offs and pickups within the Haymeadow development including Level of Service impacts at the school site(s) and key intersections. This information will allow staff to determine if the request is in alignment with Condition #6 of Section 4.11.050.A. and with Section 4.07.100.
2. Provide a re-model for all utilities, especially for water service, for the proposed increase in density within Filing 1 due to changes in uses, location, building type, and number of stories. Submit documentation to the Town Engineer showing existing utilities in Filing 1 can support proposed changes within Filing 1 and highlight any required changes to meet existing requirements. This information will allow staff to determine if the request is in alignment with Condition #6 of Section 4.11.050.A.
3. This information shall be received by staff no later than 5:00 pm, Friday March 26th, in order to be evaluated by staff and included in a supplemental staff report for the April 6th meeting.

Staff recommends APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS of file PUDA20-01, a major PUD amendment request to renovate an existing cabin currently located in open space to the East of Neighborhood D as an event space and to swap this open space parcel with land equal in size and desirability, based on Conditions 1-6 of Section 4.11.050. of the Municipal Code. Specifically, that the application:

1. Proposes temporary solutions and long-term solutions consistent with efficient development and preservation of the entire planned unit development; and
2. Would not affect either the enjoyment of land or the public interest in a substantially adverse manner; and
3. Is not granted solely to confer a special benefit upon any person; and
4. Does not contain uses that have been shown to detract from other uses approved in the PUD; and
5. Does not contain an open space plan that differs substantially in quantity or quality from that originally approved; and

6. Contains (or will) contain street and utility plans that are coordinated with planned and/or existing streets and utilities for the remainder of the PUD.

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION POTENTIAL MOTIONS

Below are the Planning and Zoning Commission options related to planned unit development amendment #PUDA20-01:

1. Recommend approval with no conditions.
2. Recommend approval with conditions.
3. Continue (table) the application:
(Provide staff and the applicant detail regarding information needed for a decision.)
4. Recommend denial:
(Cite all Code sections and/or Plan policies that resulted in motion for denial.)

FINDING OF FACT

That the application is in conformance with Sections 4.07 and 4.11 of the Land Use and Development Code and the 2010 Eagle Area Comprehensive Plan.

IF APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS, THE PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MAY CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING:

SCHOOL SITE SWAP REQUEST:

I move to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of PUDA20-01, a major PUD amendment request to swap the School Land portion of Tract E with multi-family development and to allocate a different parcel for a future school site, with the following finding of fact and CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

Finding of Fact:

That the application is in conformance with Sections 4.07 and 4.11 of the Land Use and Development Code and the 2010 Eagle Area Comprehensive Plan.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Prior to conveyance of the school site portion of Tract E from the Town of Eagle to Eagle County School District; Eagle County School District and Abrika shall enter into an agreement outlining Abrika's timing and commitment to extend road and utility improvements to the proposed school site.
2. Prior to submittal of Final Plat application or a Major Development Permit application, the applicant shall work with Town Staff and Attorney's to determine whether or not the Annexation and Development Agreement is required to be amended.
3. All details associated with the LERP units shall be evaluated at the time of the Major Development Permit review.

4. Prior to Final Plat of Tract J, provide staff with an updated traffic memo with an analysis for vehicle and bus trip at the intersection of Ouzel and Brush Creek Road that could occur as a result of moving the school closer to this intersection.
5. Included with the application for Major Development Permit, developer shall submit a Joint Excavation Plan to comply with the Town's recently passed Joint Excavation Ordinance, identifying the steps taken to install conduits and their dedication for future broadband utilities planning to serve the development.
6. Included with the application for Major Development Permit, developer shall submit documentation detailing potable water and non-potable water changes in use, quantity, pressure, etc. expected from the proposed use changes, especially as it relates to irrigation.
7. Developer shall construct pedestrian crossing improvements on Brush Creek Road at time of the Ouzel Lane Trail connection as outlined in the approved trails plan.
8. Developer shall construct pedestrian crossing improvements at the Ouzel Lane/Sylvan Lake Road roundabout with activated flashing lights at time of construction of the road and roundabout.
9. Developer shall provide a 300' building setback from the Soleil boundary and shall landscape within the setback in a manner that will create a strong buffer area between the two residential uses.

CABIN SITE REQUEST:

I move to RECOMMEND APPROVAL of PUDA20-01, a major PUD amendment request to request to renovate an existing cabin currently located in open space to the East of Neighborhood D as a Special Event space and to swap a portion of the open space parcel with land equal in size and desirability, with the following finding of fact and CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

Finding of Fact:

That the application is in conformance with Sections 4.07 and 4.11 of the Land Use and Development Code and the 2010 Eagle Area Comprehensive Plan.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The locations/descriptions of the new cabin parcel and the new open space parcel shall be included in the amended PUD. Both parcel locations and descriptions may be approved administratively without further notice, but shall be completed prior to the Town Council's consideration of the resolution approving the PUD amendment.
2. Prior to submittal of Final Plat application or a Major Development Permit application, the applicant shall work with Town Staff and Attorney's to determine whether or not the Annexation and Development Agreement is required to be amended.
3. When water and wastewater lines are within 400' of the Cabin property, on-site water and wastewater shall be required to hook-up within two (2) years.
4. Prior to applying for any Building Permits related to the cabin remodel, the applicant shall work with the Town Open Space and Trails manager to create a plan for addressing any potential disputes or conflicts between events held at the cabin and trail users.

5. Applicant to work with Open Space and Trails manager to determine appropriate access easements, signage and other requirements for Haymaker trail re-route.
6. Prior to issuance of the Building Permit for the cabin remodel, the final design for the re-alignment of the trail will be reviewed and approved administratively by the Community Development Director, without further notice.
7. The applicant shall work with Open Space and Trails manager to extinguish the temporary trail extension agreement for the Extra Credit trail and provide the appropriate new permanent trail easement. When Neighborhood D is developed, the Town would reroute any small sections of the trail that are still within Neighborhood D, so that the entire trail would be located within open space on Tract H.
8. On-site parking shall be limited to 20 spaces. Shuttles are required for special events that generate more than 20 vehicles.
9. Outdoor events at the cabin shall be seasonal and only permitted from May 15th until December 1st, or aligned with seasonal trail closures, whichever is more restrictive.



PUD Amendment

2020

Haymeadow PUD Amendment 2020

October 27, 2020
Revised February, 19 2021

Prepared for:

ABRIKA Properties, LLC
8250 Southwest 27th Avenue
Ocala FL 34476

Prepared by:

Pylman & Associates, Inc.
PO Box 2338
Edwards CO 81632



Haymeadow Project Team

Property Owner:

Abrika Properties, LLC
8250 Southwest 27th Avenue
Ocala FL 34476

Owner's Contact

Scott Schlosser
PO Box 5607
Eagle, CO 81631

Planner:

Pylman & Associates, Inc.
PO Box 2338
Edwards, CO 81632

Land Use Attorney:

Wear Travers Perkins LLC
97 Main Street Suite E 202
Edwards CO 81632

Ecological

Birch Ecology, LLC
PO Box 170
Lyons, CO 80540

Surveyor

SGM
18 W. Sixth Street, Suite 200
Glenwood Springs, CO 81601

Construction Management

Cairn Consulting Services, LLC
5197 Black Gore Drive
Vail, CO 81657

Engineer:

Alpine Engineering, Inc.
PO Box 93
Edwards, Colorado 81632

Traffic Engineer:

McDowell Engineering
PO Box 4259
Eagle CO 81631

Site Planning

DHM
311 Main Street, Suite 102
Carbondale, CO 81623

Table of Contents:

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Introduction</u>	5
1.0 <u>Description of Proposed Project</u>	5
1.1 School Site Amendment	6
1.1.2 Tract E/Neighborhood A Detailed Description	10
1.1.3 Neighborhood C Detailed Description	11
1.2 Cabin Special Events Venue	12
2.0 <u>Environmental Analysis</u>	20
3.0 <u>Conditions for PUD Amendment</u>	23
4.0 <u>Development Impact Report</u>	26

Attachments:

Figure 1	Approved PUD Development Plan	7
Figure 2	School Site/Neighborhood C Locations	8
Figure 3	Proposed Swap Parcels	13
Figure 4	Cabin Location	17
Figure 5	Cabin Parcel & Neighborhood Boundary Revision	18
Figure 6	Cabin Conceptual Site Plan	19

Appendix:

Appendix A	Revised PUD Guide
Appendix B	McDowell Engineering, LLC Traffic Memorandum

Introduction

In planning development of vertical construction in Neighborhood A1 the Haymeadow Team revisited the Eagle Area Community Plan (“EACP”) and again relied upon it to guide our vision. We were reminded of the town’s desire to cluster density nearer the town core and to maintain the “country lane feel” of Brush Creek Road.

Other documents that we reviewed in our preparation were recently commissioned housing and economic reports specific to Eagle County . These studies illustrate the acute need and demand for quality workforce housing for locals who already live here, but struggle to find housing in a market desperately short of units.

Conversations with Eagle County School District confirmed no immediate need for an additional school in Phase 1 of Haymeadow.

As we considered these things we came up with a plan that would require amending the Haymeadow PUD, a plan that would result in the addition of much needed attainable housing units delivered with the already planned first phase homes at Haymeadow. We could do this while offering Eagle County School District a larger parcel of land in an outlying neighborhood allowing the demand to activate the school site to happen more naturally than it would as part of Neighborhood A1.

The idea also better conformed with the EACP in terms of increasing density nearer town and decreasing it in the outlying neighborhoods and further up Brush Creek Road. As the plan took shape more benefits to this proposed land swap became evident.

Our planning also reinvigorated early conversations surrounding the future of the original ranch manager’s cabin/headquarters. As part of our proposal we include a plan to redesign and activate the cabin area to the benefit of the community and as an economic engine for Eagle’s businesses.

1.0 Description of proposed project.

The Haymeadow PUD was approved by Town of Eagle Ordinance No. 11, Series of 2014 after several years of PUD Concept Zoning Plan and PUD Zoning Plan review.

The development plan for Haymeadow evolved out of a careful analysis of many factors, including the [2010 Eagle Area Community Plan](#), existing growth and land use patterns, anticipated long term residential housing needs, existing and desired recreational amenities, existing and planned traffic circulation patterns and the landforms and environmental sensitivities of the property.

The primary element of the design influence was clearly the Eagle Area Community Plan. Alignment to the revised EACP was and remains very important to the development team. In fact, the project’s initial application was tabled until the new EACP could be formed and adopted by the Town of Eagle. The result is a PUD that closely aligns with the applicable goals of the 2010 EACP. Specifically the chapters on *Vision, Land Use* and the *Conservation Oriented Development* section of [Chapter 4](#) all gave very specific direction to the Haymeadow design. The concepts of livability, sense of community, stewardship of the natural environment and compact walkable neighborhoods are also all reflected in the approved plan.



The approved plan consists of five distinct neighborhoods, community parks, a fire station, a K-8 sized public school site and expansive open space tracts. The plan features extensive setbacks from Brush Creek Road and a diminishing level of density as the property transitions up Brush Creek Road. The neighborhoods are situated around a framework of open space corridors, parks and trails that create an organized layout of neighborhoods and public spaces.

The Haymeadow PUD is approved for 837 dwelling units on 660 acres. This includes 344 multi-family units and 493 single family/duplex units. Multi-family units are distributed throughout Neighborhoods A1, A2, B and C. Multi-family housing opportunities have always been envisioned as a variety of home sizes that will range from entry level condominiums to larger family oriented townhomes and flats. Approximately 335 acres of the total area of 660 acres has been designated as open space.

The approved Development Plan outlines the general location of the proposed primary access roads, neighborhoods, school, fire station and parks and open space areas. (See Figure 1, Approved Development Plan)


The purpose of this application is to propose two distinct amendments to the approved Haymeadow PUD. The first amendment is a proposal to change the configuration of the approved PUD Development Plan by shifting the location of the proposed school site and some of the multi-family residential units. The second proposed amendment is to improve and utilize the existing cabin at the east end of Haymeadow as a community and special event space. The following sections of this application narrative will describe these two proposals in detail.

1.1 School site amendment

Specifically, the proposed amendment to the PUD for the school site will shift the approved Eagle County School District ("ECSD") school site from the current Tract E location to a site in Neighborhood C. (See Figure 2, School Site/Neighborhood C locations) The approved multi-family unit density in Neighborhoods B & C (112 units total) will be shifted onto the currently approved school site on Tract E. The proposed amendment is essentially a swap in the location of the school and the Neighborhood B/C multi-family density.

- A 14.22 acre portion of Tract E that was intended for a school will be re-classified within the PUD Development Plan and PUD Guide as a part of Neighborhood A and the density of Neighborhood A will be increased by 112 units.
- An 18.3 acre portion of Neighborhood C will be re-classified as school use and the multi-family density of Neighborhoods B and C will be correspondingly reduced by 112 units. That action will remove all multi-family density from Neighborhoods B & C.
- The public park portion of Tract E that has been dedicated to the Town of Eagle will remain at 18.513 acres.
- 24% of the multi-family units will be designated as deed restricted LERP units, providing much needed affordable housing.





The shift of the multi-family density from Neighborhoods B and C into Neighborhood A1 allows Haymeadow to integrate more multi-family homes into the recently installed Phase 1 infrastructure.

This will allow Haymeadow to better respond to the current housing demand for entry level and attainably priced units earlier in the project and to place those units closer to the community core, a principle highlighted in the EACP. The current level of extreme housing demand for entry level and attainable units was not foreseen in the planning stages that took place prior to the 2014 approval. The applicant believes that the ability to accelerate the pace of multi-family development and use economies of scale to design and build a more attainable housing product targeted to the “missing middle” is a significant public benefit provided by the proposed PUD Amendment. The amendment of 14.2 acres of Tract E to residential and of 18.3 acres of Neighborhood C to school site represents an additional increase in the overall Haymeadow public school land dedication of 4.08 acres. The proposed school location is more centrally located within Haymeadow and may be a better, more proximate geographic location to serve portions of Eagle Ranch. The amendment would also leave scarce water resources in the river by eliminating the need to continue intensive irrigation of the 14 acre school site for the many years that it will sit vacant.

There is no increase in density from the overall approved PUD. The overall approval will remain at 837 dwelling units with the same ratio of 344 multi-family units and 493 single family/duplex units. The change in school site/multi-family residential location creates no change to the amount of park or open space land areas except for the 2.6 acre increase in open space created by the Soleil building setback limit described below in Section 1.1.2.

Neighborhood	2014 Approved Density	Proposed Density
A1	228	340 (+112)
A2	189	189
B	209	161 (-48)
C	161	97(-64)
D	50	50
TOTAL density	837	837

Assuming approval of these applications, a final plat application process will follow. This final plat will create the division of Tract E, create the new school site in Neighborhood C and create a new parcel around the cabin.

Upon approval of the PUD Amendment and final plat:

1. The Town of Eagle will convey the original school site portion of Tract E to the ECSD.
2. ECSD will then convey the Tract E site to Haymeadow



3. Haymeadow will convey the new Neighborhood C school site to the ECSD.

The development of the multi-family units would then be contingent upon a Major Development Permit approval and concurrent approval of architectural and landscape design guidelines.

1.1.2 Tract E/Neighborhood A detailed description

The Town of Eagle land use regulations include a requirement that all developments dedicate land or make a cash-in-lieu payment to mitigate impacts of said development upon the school system. The land dedication and/or cash-in-lieu fee is calculated in accordance with a formula within the land use regulations that determines student generation based upon the number and type of residential units and converts that figure into an acreage demand.

The Town of Eagle formal dedication requirement based on the approved density within the Haymeadow PUD is 8.0665 acres of land. Early discussions with school district personnel and town staff identified Haymeadow as a desirable location for a school site so the project planning always included an actual land dedication as opposed to the fee-in-lieu payment option. Those discussions also identified the potential desire/need for a K-8 facility. The early planning discussions identified that while the 8.066 acre dedication requirement would accommodate an elementary school the general rule of thumb for a K-8 school was 15 acres. Therefore, in the original PUD Zoning and Sketch Plan application to the Town in 2011, the Haymeadow plan proposed a 15 acre school site. This land dedication was offered above and beyond the 8.066 acre requirement.

Through the subsequent Town of Eagle review and approval process the dividing line between the proposed 15 acre school site and the adjacent proposed 15 acre town park site was eliminated and the site was slightly enlarged. Haymeadow committed to and has now made a dedication of 32.7 acres to the Town of Eagle, known as Tract E, as a combined school and park land dedication. The thought at the time was that the Town of Eagle, Mountain Recreation and the Eagle County School District ("ECSD") would collaborate on an overall site plan and then the town would dedicate the appropriate land to ECSD.

Since the 2014 approval ECSD has continued to monitor growth rates and demographic trends. ECSD now projects that the demand for a new K-8 school in Eagle may be several years away. The school/park site (Tract E) is located at the entrance to Haymeadow and is within the first phase of road and utility infrastructure that is currently development ready. There is an opportunity to utilize this infrastructure improved school site for multi-family housing by relocating the school site to a future phase of Haymeadow. In short, we can meet local housing demands sooner without impacting ECSD's near term needs for an additional school in Eagle and better serve the guiding principles of the EACP by clustering higher density housing types nearer to the town core.

Mountain Recreation and the Town of Eagle recently completed a conceptual planning effort to identify potential future development of the town park portion of Tract E. While these plans are very conceptual and are likely to be refined over time this effort has allowed Haymeadow a better understanding of the proposed park layout needs. Haymeadow has proposed a potential property line between the park site and the school site. This dividing line would leave an 18 acre park site to be retained and owned by the town and create a 14.2 acre site to be dedicated to ECSD. Haymeadow



would then swap the 14.2 acre portion of Tract E for an 18.3 acre site in Neighborhood C at the corner of Sylvan Lake Road and Ouzel Lane. The SWAP results in an additional 4.1 acres of dedicated land to ECSD.

Recognizing that this is a change in use that could be viewed as potentially impactful to the adjacent Soleil neighborhood Haymeadow is willing to commit to a 300 foot vertical building setback from the Soleil boundary and to landscape within that setback area in a manner that will create a strong buffer area between the two residential uses. This commitment has been written into the amended PUD Guide and will become a formal part of the Haymeadow requirements and regulations. This setback creates an additional effective net increase of open space by 2.6 acres.

The approved PUD Development Plan would be amended by this application to enlarge the existing Neighborhood A1 area to include the 14.2 acres of Tract E and designate that area for multi-family construction. The existing multi-family density of 112 units that is currently approved for Neighborhoods B & C would be transferred to Neighborhood A1. Neighborhood A1 is the closest neighborhood to the community core and at 41.7 acres is currently approved for 146 multi-family units and 82 single family/duplex units. In accordance with the objectives of the Eagle Area Community plan Neighborhood A1 is the highest density neighborhood at 5.4 units per acre. The addition of 14.2 acres and 112 units would shift Neighborhood A1 slightly higher to a density of 6 units per acre.

All multi-family development within Haymeadow, as similar to Eagle Ranch, must receive a formal approval through the Major Development Permit public hearing process prior to the commencement of any building. This Major Development Permit process will identify and review specific site planning details such as access points, road layout, unit number and specific architectural and landscape design. The original Haymeadow approval also requires a Major Development Permit review process for Town of Eagle review and approval of a set of internal Design Review Guidelines. It is anticipated that these Major Development Permits would follow the final plat process.

1.1.3 Neighborhood C Detailed Description

Neighborhood C is located at the intersection Sylvan Lake Road and Ouzel Lane and is just across Ouzel Lane from the 20 acre Trailhead Park and the proposed fire station. Neighborhood C consists of 47.1 acres and is approved for 64 multi-family units and 97 single family/duplex units for a total of 161 homes. This application proposes transferring the 64 multi-family units approved for Neighborhood C and the 48 multi-family units approved in Neighborhood B to Neighborhood A1.

Eighteen acres of Neighborhood C would be designated as a school site and conveyed to ECSD. This land dedication remains well in excess of the 8.066 acre requirement and enhances the ability of ECSD to plan for a future K-8 school. The school site would be located at the intersection of Sylvan Lake Road and Ouzel Lane and would allow for several points of access and very efficient internal circulation. The school location at the intersection of Ouzel and Sylvan Lake Road and the expanded acreage would allow for buses and other school traffic to circulate into, through and to exit back to Ouzel and Sylvan Lake Road with all right-hand turn movements. This greatly enhances traffic flow and eliminates some of the issues experienced at other Town of Eagle school locations, including the existing Haymeadow Tract E school site.



The existing approved trails plan includes a 10-foot-wide paved pedestrian path from Sylvan Lake Road along Ouzel Lane to the Brush Creek Road intersection. This trail connects to the exiting trail on Ouzel Lane in Eagle Ranch for full pedestrian connectivity from Eagle Ranch to the new school site. The applicant would commit to including pedestrian crossing improvements to Brush Creek Road at the time of Ouzel Lane construction. These improvements would include delineated crosswalks and a pedestrian activated flashing light system similar to the roundabout flashing light systems. The Ouzel Lane/Sylvan Lake Road roundabout will also include pedestrian activated flashing lights.

The extensive trails system as designed and approved in the Haymeadow Trails Plan will provide multiple paved and soft surface bicycle and pedestrian connection routes throughout Haymeadow and will connect the school site to all neighborhoods and neighborhood sidewalks and amenities, including the pool and ice rink complex.

The residential portion of Neighborhood C would be reduced in size accordingly and would become 28.8 acres in size. The approved density of 97 single family/duplex units would remain in place for a slightly reduced overall density of 3.3 units an acre.

Neighborhood B would remain at 61.0 acres and the density would be reduced by the approved 48 multi-family units that would be transferred to Neighborhood A1. The approved 161 single family/duplex units would be retained in Neighborhood B. The overall density of Neighborhood B would be reduced from 3.4 units per acre to 2.6 units per acre. (See Figure 3, Proposed Swap Parcels)

1.2 Cabin Special Events Venue

The second proposed amendment to the approved PUD is to improve the existing cabin located at the eastern end of the Haymeadow site and to utilize the cabin as a special events venue. We believe the proposed use is consistent with the existing PUD Guide as the area is already approved for use for special events; however, prior to making a substantial investment in the improvements we would like to clarify what was meant in the PUD Guide by “special events.”

The concept is to create a very high quality, luxury events venue capable of serving gatherings ranging from small groups of as few as 20 people up to 170 person weddings, reunions, or other larger events.

The Haymeadow property was originally a part of the extensive holdings of the Adam’s Rib Ranch. Prior to the sale of the property in 2005 the cabin was used by Adam’s Rib Ranch as housing for the ranch foreman. As a part of the purchase agreement Adam’s Rib Ranch continued to use the cabin for ranch housing for the next two years. The cabin has been vacant since 2007 but has been well maintained. The building is a log cabin structure of approximately 1,500 square feet on the main floor with two bedrooms and one bathroom. The second floor consists of a 500 square foot bedroom with one bathroom.

The cabin is located in an upland area just above the irrigated hay fields, surrounded by lands that will eventually be dedicated to the Town of Eagle as open space upon the development of Neighborhood D. In the meantime, the cabin area and the future Neighborhood D remain under




Figure 3 Proposed Swap Parcels

ABRIKA ownership. The existing Haymaker Trail wraps around both sides of the cabin. Subsequent to initial application meetings with Town of Eagle staff the applicant and staff have determined that the ownership of the cabin should stay with ABRIKA. As such a 5.8 acre parcel that contains the cabin and all of the associated improvements has been identified and delineated on the proposed revised PUD Development Plan. In order to maintain an equal amount of open space in the PUD the Neighborhood D development area has been decreased by the same 5.8 acre area. This 1 to 1 exchange of development area in Neighborhood D for the cabin parcel ensures that the overall amount of town owned open space in Haymeadow remains the same as currently approved.

The decrease in area of Neighborhood D has been taken out of the north boundary of the development area.

The cabin has historically functioned on an existing well and septic system. Electric service is provided via an overhead line from Brush Creek Road. Access to the cabin is from a driveway off of Brush Creek Road.

The septic system will be evaluated and upgraded to current On-site Wastewater Treatment System (OWTS) standards. The septic system would be utilized for the in-cabin facilities only. This will consist of two simple bathrooms and a residential scale kitchen.

The existing well is capable of serving the domestic needs for the cabin. The proposed landscape improvements are less than one acre in area and will be irrigated from the nearby ditch.

A water storage tank and pump system for fire department use will be designed and installed as a part of the cabin and site upgrades. This system will be typical to the way fire protection is designed and built into homes served by well water. The applicant anticipates that the fire protection system will be designed to meet the standards of NFPA 1142 Water Supplies for Suburban and Rural firefighting. The concept is to utilize buried HPDE cisterns that are set above the cabin in elevation and equipped with a dry hydrant. Based on current NFPA criteria the minimum cistern size will be not less than 3000 gallons.

The existing power line will be undergrounded from a point out in the field to be determined in consultation with Holy Cross Energy. Any upgrades to the power capacity required to serve the facility will be made as necessary. If special events have a power demand requirement greater than the electrical capacity of the site then a portable generator will be utilized.

The interior of the cabin would be remodeled to serve as an event headquarters. The floor plan will stay essentially the same, and will remain as an approximately 1,800 square foot three bedroom two bathroom cabin. The existing decks would be rebuilt and expanded to accommodate larger outdoor dining and group gathering capacities. Other than cosmetic upgrades, there are no proposed changes or additions to the exterior of the cabin or the existing cabin footprint. The building remodel design and permitting will address the condition of the well and septic system, the roof and floor loading, electrical and heating upgrades and will include a security system. All aspects of the cabin will be brought up to current code requirements.

At the time that municipal water and wastewater infrastructure is extended into Neighborhood D the cabin will be connected to that infrastructure and the well and OTWS system will be properly abandoned.

A significant landscape improvement project would include small gathering areas, an event lawn and a large tent lawn area. The tent lawn would accommodate an event tent and catering tent area capable of serving up to 150-170 people. A service area and a specifically designed location for temporary/portable sanitation facilities will be incorporated into the site improvements. All special events of a capacity that utilize any of the outdoor decks or spaces will utilize the portable porta-potty locations. Each event will be evaluated for capacity needs and the appropriate number of porta-potty's will be brought in and out to serve the event. This will include ADA accessible units as required to meet current codes.

The driveway will be improved and will terminate in a cul-de-sac designed to meet ADA access requirements and fire truck turning radius standards.

A small parking area will be created below the cabin, within walking distance, for small events and service vehicles. The applicant anticipates that a shuttle service will be required and provided for larger events and that all parking for larger events will take place off-site. This is consistent with other destination venue practices, such as occurs locally at Piney Lake, Eaton Ranch and other local event venues. Shuttle pick-up will be at the attendees residence or hotel, or within a privately arranged parking lot. No shuttle pick up will be allowed from Town of Eagle or other public parking lots or from on-street public parking.


The existing Haymaker Trail loops around the cabin on both the uphill and downhill side of the cabin. This application proposes to relocate the lower portion of the loop to the lower side of the existing irrigation ditch to provide greater separation from the cabin and a better trail user experience. Haymeadow will be responsible for all design and construction costs for the re-route and will provide a new access easement for the trail to the town. Haymeadow will work with the town open space department on both the trail design and on appropriate signage to ensure user safety at the driveway trail crossing. Haymeadow believes that the proposed special events use and the trail use are compatible. There will be no limitations placed on trail use due to this application. The final plat that creates the cabin parcel will include appropriate easements for the Haymaker Trail.

The applicant anticipates that larger outdoor events such as weddings would occur approximately twenty times per year from April 15 through November. Smaller events using the cabin and deck space will also be scheduled through this time frame. The cabin may be used for small meetings, dinners and party events as well as serving as support space for the larger events. For example, the cabin may be used as dressing room/staging area for a bridal party during wedding events. The cabin may be used for selective overnight use by members of a wedding party or other special event users. The PUD Guide limits this usage to no more than two consecutive nights by the same user.

All events will be supported by the use of temporary sanitation facilities and catering services. The cabin kitchen and bathrooms are not intended to serve special events needs.

No events utilizing outdoor space shall be allowed between the dates of December 1 and April 15. Small scale events utilizing only the interior of the cabin would be allowed and scheduled throughout the year.

The venue will be made available to local non-profit groups at a discounted or donated rate for local fundraising events. Businesses local to the Town of Eagle would be highlighted as our preferred vendors on an approved list for catering, florals, décor, photography, transportation, entertainment, etc. and rate discounts will be provided when local vendors are selected. We anticipate the cabin event venue creating a multi-million-dollar economic opportunity for local businesses. (See Figure 4, Cabin Location & Figure 5, Cabin Conceptual Site Plan.



APPROVAL OF THIS PLAN CONSTITUTES A VESTED PROPERTY RIGHT PURSUANT TO SECTION 24-68-103,C.R.S., AS AMENDED

See Haymeadow PUD Development Plan Application Book dated 12/2013 for general descriptions, as amended by the approved Haymeadow PUD Annexation Development Agreement.

Figure 4 Cabin Location



Haymeadow

PARCEL I-CABIN SITE

dan design | pyman assoc. | alpine engineering

scale = 1" = 60'

SCALE:
1" = 60'

0' 30' 60' 120'

↑ N

Figure 5 Cabin Parcel & Neighborhood D Boundary Revision




Figure 6 Conceptual Cabin Site Plan

2.0 Environmental Analysis

The approved Haymeadow PUD included a thorough environmental analysis of the property that was reviewed as a part of the Haymeadow Concept and Zoning PUD review processes. Environmentally sensitive portions of the property such as wildlife habitat, wetlands, geologically sensitive areas and drainageways were identified and protected by designating these areas as open space. The school and the multi-family locations were found to be areas suitable for development and are approved for such uses. The relocation of the school parcel into Neighborhood C and the shift of Neighborhood B & C multi-family density onto the Tract E school site should not create any new adverse environmental impacts.

Western Ecosystems, Inc. completed a wildlife analysis of the Haymeadow property for the approved PUD Concept plan and the PUD Zoning Plan applications.

The Western Ecosystems, Inc. assessment is based upon existing CDOW wildlife habitat mapping, Mr. Thompson's extensive field analysis of this site and adjacent private properties, which have been ongoing since 1994, and conversations with CDOW and Town of Eagle representatives.

The report includes an in depth analysis and description of each habitat type found on the site and provides a series of development recommendations designed to mitigate project impact upon wildlife values. The Haymeadow PUD Development Plan is in conformance with these recommendations.

Western Ecological Resource, Inc completed a thorough description of existing vegetation communities, an evaluation of the presence of federal threatened, endangered and candidate plants and provided an estimate of impacts to the various vegetation communities for the approved Haymeadow PUD Concept and Zoning Plans.

Of the 660 acres that comprise the Haymeadow property the development plan as designed impacts only 17.69 acres of native vegetation and will impact 509 acres of introduced non-native vegetation.

The Haymeadow open space corridors have been strategically designed to protect wetlands, riparian areas and large stands of Cottonwood and Willow trees.

The proposed amendment to the PUD does not add any additional impact to native vegetation areas or to wetlands. The proposed uses will occur in areas of introduced or disturbed vegetation.

The improvement and use of the existing cabin should have a minimal impact upon any environmental factors. The cabin is located immediately above Neighborhood D, which has been approved for residential development. The upland vegetation in the vicinity of the cabin has been previously disturbed by the cabin use and is largely composed of non-native weeds. The use of the cabin for large outdoor events will be limited to the months of May through October to limit any potential wildlife impacts and large special events were already contemplated and approved in the original PUD.

Access and Traffic

The proposed shift in location of the school and of the Neighborhood B and C multi-family density does not create any new density or uses and will not change the overall traffic volumes generated from the Haymeadow site. No change in the layout of the primary roads; Sylvan Lake Road and Ouzel Lane is proposed. The shift in the location of the residential and school uses does change the anticipated trip distribution and the traffic patterns. McDowell Engineering, LLC has completed an analysis of the proposal and presented an updated trip generation and distribution analysis. Most of the changes to trip distribution occur internal to Haymeadow.

The 14.2 acres of land that would be incorporated from Tract E into Neighborhood A1 has several potential points of access. There has always been an assumed direct access point from Sylvan Lake Road and access may also be extended from the Neighborhood A roads of Mt Hope Circle and Snowy Peak. Haymeadow does not anticipate or propose an extension of Field Street through the Soleil neighborhood into Haymeadow.

The cabin will continue to be accessed via the existing driveway from Brush Creek Road. This driveway will be improved and widened to a year-round gravel surface with pull-off lanes. The increase in traffic on Brush Creek Road will be minimal compared to the background traffic levels given the intent to have large events shuttled to the site. The intersection access improvements will likely require and include the addition of a turn lane to Brush Creek Road. The McDowell Engineering Traffic memorandum is attached as Appendix B

Water and Wastewater

As there is no increase or decrease in the intensity or density of the proposed plan there is no effect upon the water rights dedication requirements or the capacity of the water and wastewater plants and infrastructure.

The proposed residential parcel in Neighborhood A is lower in elevation than the recently installed Filing 1 water system and therefore will have higher static pressure than the majority of Filing 1 units. The highest finish floor elevation would be approximately 6711 feet. Assuming a three story building, the upper floors would be approximately 6738 feet in elevation. This corresponds to an approximate static pressure of 46.5 based on the Town of Eagle Mott MacDonald model summary memo dated March 8, 2019. Given this pressure level and the fact that the model contemplated a 600 student K-8 school at this location, there should be no issue with water pressure or water quantity. The water sewer and non-potable systems have been designed to accommodate this capacity.

The existing well and septic system at the cabin will be upgraded as necessary to serve the proposed uses. Most, if not all events, will be required to provide supplemental portable sanitation facilities based on the projected attendance. The site improvements will provide a specifically designed and designated location for portable sanitation facilities.

Emergency Services



The applicant has had an early conversation with representatives of the Greater Eagle Fire Protection District. At this time there are no identified negative impacts associated with the shift in location of the school and multi-family uses. The new school site would be located right across the street from the Haymeadow fire station. The proposed multi-family site has multiple points of access and may be designed to meet fire department access requirements.

The cabin will be retrofitted to all applicable building and fire codes and the access and turnaround area will be built to accommodate emergency service vehicles.

LERP program

As there is no change in density and no change in the multi-family and single family/duplex unit ratio there is no effect upon the LERP program requirements of the Haymeadow PUD. The approved Haymeadow LERP plan requires that 10% of the 837 units be deed restricted as LERP units and requires them all to be multi-family units. The shift in location of the multi-family units into Neighborhood A1 will allow more multi-family to be constructed in earlier phases of the project, which will result in substantially more LERP units constructed sooner. In order to meet the overall 10% requirement 24% of all the multi-family units will be designated as LERP units.

Eagle Area Community Plan/Elevate Eagle

As stated above, the approved Haymeadow plan was designed to a very high level of compliance with the EACP.

The EACP includes a vision statement and the Vision chapter of the plan (page 5) includes eleven planning concepts as integral to the Town's vision statement. These planning concepts are broad based statements that apply well to the overall Haymeadow PUD and were important in informing the design process. The shift in location of the school and the multi-family does not create any adverse effect upon the overall compliance of the Haymeadow PUD with any of the vision elements of the Eagle Area Community Plan.

Another important element of the EACP is the Land Use Chapter (page 15). The Land Use Chapter recognizes six primary factors that influence land use decisions. Again, the approved Haymeadow plan closely hews to these factors and was found to be in compliance with this important section of the EACP. The shift in location of the school and the multi-family does not create any adverse effect upon the overall compliance of the Haymeadow PUD with these six factors of the Land Use Chapter.

A strong tenet of the EACP was to locate higher densities closer to the community core and to feather out the unit per acre density as the distance from the community core increased (page 7, Factors of Livability #1). The proposed PUD amendment creates a higher level of compliance with this aspect of the EACP. The EACP also notes that "a healthy vibrant community should have... a range of housing choices for residents at all income levels, and that the development of workforce and affordable housing in Eagle can help to ensure a more sustainable community"(Chapter 10, page 132). Chapter 10 of the EACP is the Housing section. This section of the EACP discusses housing needs, goals and policies at some length. The proposed PUD Amendment creates a higher level of compliance with this aspect of the EACP, as it allows Haymeadow to accelerate the phasing of multi-family units.



The shift in location of the school and the multi-family does not create any adverse effect upon the overall compliance of the Haymeadow PUD with the Eagle Area Community Plan.

The Town of Eagle adopted the Elevate Eagle Comprehensive Plan on December 5, 2020. This application was filed prior to the final adoption of that plan, however many of the aspects of the Elevate Eagle plan also support the proposed PUD Amendment.

The very first goal articulated in the plan, Goal 1-1 (page 48) states: *"Promote a wide range of attainable housing opportunities for young adults, families, aging residents, workforce and others."* The sub-policies to Goal 1-1 numbered 1-1.1 and 1-1.3 directly support the proposed PUD Amendment.

The second goal of the Elevate Eagle plan is Goal 1-2, (page 48) which states: *"Expand and diversify the Town's economic opportunities."*

The proposed amendment to the PUD to clarify and detail use of the cabin for special events will create a new highly desirable economic generator within the community.

The Who We Are section (page 78/79) of the Elevate Eagle Plan clearly articulates the importance and benefit of creating a variety of attainable housing options to support new employees and their families, as well as retirees and millennials.

The Where We Live section (pages 83/83) articulates the need for "middle" section housing. The section describes the Eagle demographics that are currently weighted heavily toward single family housing stock with some rental opportunities, but with limited opportunities in the middle sector. Haymeadow is weighted 60%/40% single family/multi-family. Shifting some of this multi-family into Neighborhood A allows for a higher range of multi-family unit types and price points and allows those units to be delivered earlier in the project phasing.

The Economy section (page 84/85) states the importance of housing availability to the economy, relaying the often stated finding that the lack of attainable housing is a primary factor hindering employee retention and business growth.

3.0 Conditions for PUD Amendment

In accordance with the Town of Eagle Town Code Section 4.11.050 an approved PUD zoning plan or an approved PUD development plan may be amended if the applicant demonstrates that the proposed modification:

1. Is consistent with the efficient development and preservation of the entire planned unit development.

The proposed amendment is consistent with, and in fact, improves upon, the efficient development and preservation of the entire planned unit development. Given changes in demographics and student enrollment studied by ECSD. The district is not likely to build a school within Haymeadow



for a 5 to 10 year period. However, the originally approved school site is within the first phase of Haymeadow infrastructure; which has all access, water, wastewater and shallow utility infrastructure in place and is development ready. The relocation of the school site to Neighborhood C and the shift of Neighborhood B & C units to the approved school site allows for an efficient development of the PUD and for an efficient use of the existing first phase infrastructure network.

The originally proposed proximity of the school and town park has the potential for some synergy of shared use, primarily for event overflow parking and the proximity of the park facilities to the school. The applicant believes that the proposed shift in location of the school and residential uses provides equal if not improved synergies.

The proposed school site is less than 3,000 feet from the current site and has multiple paved and soft surface path connections. The overflow parking concept of using the school parking will still function for weekend and bike race special events and will disperse and remove parking from the heart of the park/trailhead complex. Additional Haymaker Trail access points and trailhead parking locations are designed into the future neighborhoods of Haymeadow. As these access points come online the proposed school would be better located as a secondary overflow parking area. The school and the adjacent 14-acre Trailhead Park will provide great trail access into the Eagle Ranch trail system as well. The applicant believes that any discussion over adjacent use synergy needs to be looked at in the full buildout perspective of the Haymeadow improvements.

The addition of residential units closer to the core of downtown Eagle and Eagle Ranch will add to the energy and vibrancy of those important areas. The proximity of residential units to the pool, ice rink and trailhead complex will be a terrific amenity for those citizens and will help to energize the park. The ability to add more multi-family residential units sooner, units that are targeted to a difficult to serve housing demographic, and accelerate the pace of LERP units seems to be a greater community benefit than the provision of occasional overflow parking.

The new school site is more centrally located within Haymeadow and has a better distance separation from the existing Brush Creek Elementary School. The location at the intersection of Ouzel Lane and Sylvan Lake Road allows for very good access from Haymeadow and from Eagle Ranch. The roundabout design will allow school traffic, including buses, to access the school site without requiring a left-hand turn movement. The left-hand turn movement into schools has proven to create short term traffic issues at key drop off and pick up times. The new school site is immediately adjacent to the 14-acre Trailhead park, the primary destination public park amenity for Haymeadow. This park will include fields, multi-age group play areas, community buildings which could be programmed for before and after school activities. The school is connected to every neighborhood via a system of multiple paved, soft surface and single track trails, which in turn will be connected to the neighborhood sidewalks.

The utilization of the cabin as an events center and community gathering spot is entirely consistent with the efficient development and preservation of the entire PUD. The cabin has the potential to become a tremendous Haymeadow and greater community amenity, serving as a local gathering/meeting/event venue and creating a substantial economic benefit through the use of local vendors.

2. Does not affect in a substantially adverse manner either the enjoyment of land abutting upon, adjoining or across a street from the Planned Unit Development or the public interest.

The applicant does not believe that the proposed amendment has a substantial adverse effect upon any lands abutting or within the PUD. The application does not propose any new uses for the approved PUD, it merely shifts the location of existing approved uses. School, residential and park uses are compatible with one another as is evidenced by the location of schools throughout the greater community. The applicant will commit to a 300 foot vertical building setback from the shared Soleil property line. This buffer will allow for a significant landscape and bermed buffer between the two residential uses. The approved Haymeadow PUD already includes a 200 foot open space buffer between the Neighborhood C lands and the two homes located along Brush Creek Road. This open space buffer provides a substantial setback from the Haymeadow Neighborhood C development area and the proposed school site.

The cabin is located towards the northeastern corner of the Haymeadow property and is separated from the nearest residences along Brush Creek Road by 3,500 feet; slightly more than a half mile in distance. The Haymeadow property in the area between Brush Creek Road and the cabin consists of two distinct topographic areas. There is a very distinct vertical grade change that runs in an east-west direction parallel to Brush Creek Road, likely an ancient riverbank. The entire lower bench, which is visible from Brush Creek Road, is designated as open space and will remain in agricultural production. The upper bench is the site of the 50-acre Neighborhood D and the cabin area is largely screened from Brush Creek Road by the grade change.

The Haymeadow PUD Guide, the control document for the entire project, has been revised to include noise limits and restrictions on hours of operation.

3. Is not granted solely to confer a special benefit upon any person

The amendment as proposed will foster the efficient development of the PUD and provide an opportunity to develop much needed multi-family housing in an earlier phase of the development, while still providing a school site that will meet the needs of the school district and the overall community. This does not confer a special benefit upon any person.

The cabin events venue will create a community amenity and economic benefit to the greater community.

4. Does not contain proposed uses that detract from other uses approved in the PUD

The school and multi-family shift in location does not create any new uses. The approved PUD also includes the use of special events on both open space and development areas.

5. Does not contain an open space plan that differs substantially in quantity or quality from that originally approved

The proposed amendment does not differ in the approved open space quantity or quality of the approved plan. In fact, the addition of the proposed Soleil setback effectively increases the amount of open space in the PUD.



6. Contains street and utility plans that are coordinated with planned and/or existing streets and utilities for the remainder of the PUD

There are no significant changes to the existing or approved street and utility plans.

4.0 Development Impact Report

The Town of Eagle Land Use Regulations Section 4.07.100 is titled Development Impact Report. The intent of this section of the land use regulations is to ensure that development proposals address and evaluate potential impacts. The section of the Haymeadow PUD Amendment and Preliminary Plan application responds to the purpose, intent and details of this portion of the town land use regulations. Sections taken directly from the Town of Eagle Land Use Regulations are expressed in a bold text format. The applicant responses are expressed in a standard text format.

Purpose - It is the purpose of this Section to:

- 1. Ensure that complete information concerning any adverse effects of the proposed development or subdivision on the environment and essential public and private services and facilities, including educational facilities, as well as the health, safety, order, convenience, prosperity and welfare of present and future inhabitants of the Town is available to the Town Board, the Planning and Zoning Commission and the general public;**

Applicant response: The approved PUD Development Plan included a thorough environmental analysis of the property and that analysis was reviewed as a part of the Haymeadow PUD Zoning and Development Plan review processes. Those Haymeadow applications were assembled in a comprehensive manner and included information throughout the narrative application and the appendices that addresses the environment, essential public and private services and facilities, educational facilities, and the health, safety, order, convenience, prosperity and welfare of present and future inhabitants of the Town.

Environmentally sensitive portions of the property such as wetlands and drainageways were identified and protected by designating these areas as open space. The school and the multi-family locations were found to be areas suitable for development.

The relocation of the school parcel into Neighborhood C and the shift of Neighborhood B & C multi-family density onto the Tract E school site does not create any adverse environmental impacts, have any adverse impact upon the provision of the above listed services or other impact to the community that was not identified and mitigated as a part of the 2014 PUD approval.

The proposed use of the existing cabin as a special events and community venue also should not create any adverse environmental impacts. The area of the cabin includes the Haymaker Trail and the activities associated with the trail. The area just below the cabin is the 50-acre neighborhood D that is approved for 50 homesites. The improvement of the cabin would encourage the developer to cluster development of Neighborhood D closer to Neighborhoods B & C.



- 1. Ensure that long term protection of the environment and the provision of essential public and private services and facilities such as streets, utilities, and educational facilities are considered in major development and subdivision planning and that land use and development decisions, both public and private, take into account the relative merits of possible alternative actions; and**

Applicant response: The 2014 Haymeadow PUD application included a robust environmental analysis of geology, vegetation, wildlife, traffic, drainage, utilities, and water rights and provided information on these topics as well as schools that allowed town officials and citizens opportunity to consider these factors as they evaluated the proposal. The end result of that review process was the 2014 PUD Development Plan and Preliminary plan approval. The geologic, vegetation, wildlife, drainage, utility and water rights analyses are unaffected by this shift in location of land uses and by the proposed use of the existing cabin. This application includes an update to the trip distribution study so that aspect of the proposed amendment may be adequately reviewed as a part of this application.

- 1. Ensure that proposed developments and subdivisions promote a healthful and convenient distribution of population, the wise and efficient expenditure of public funds, including the funds of other governmental entities, as well as the adequate provision of essential public services, facilities and requirements, including schools; and**

Applicant response: This application proposes a shift in location of some multi-family density and of the proposed school site. The application materials are sufficient to allow the reviewers the ability to evaluate any adverse impact to the distribution of population. The proposed new school site provides more than adequate land area for a K-8 school, far exceeds the Town of Eagle Land Use Regulations dedication requirement area and is well located for convenient and safe access. The proposed cabin use does not affect the distribution of population, increase any expenditure of public funds or affect the provision of public services in an adverse manner.

- 1. Provide procedures for local review and evaluation of the environmental and social-economic effects of proposed development projects and subdivisions, including essential public and private services and facilities, prior to granting major development permits or subdivision approvals; and**

Applicant response: No applicant response is necessary to this section of the Intent. This section of the Town of Eagle Land Use Regulations provides the procedures stated above and the Haymeadow review process is in compliance with those procedures.

- 1. Provide for the reasonable and adequate mitigation of on-site and off- site impacts generated by the proposed development or subdivision on the environment and essential public or private services and facilities, including streets, utilities and educational facilities.**

Applicant response: This application has evaluated on-site and off-site impacts. The applicant does not believe there are any on or off-site impacts that require mitigation above and beyond the

current PUD approval.

Preliminary Impact Report

Every Development Permit Application and Preliminary Subdivision Plan shall include a preliminary statement of whether the proposed project will, will not, or could possibly affect the environment, either during construction or on a continuing basis, in each of the following respects:

By altering an ecological unit or land form, such as a ridgeline, saddle, draw, ravine, hillside, cliff, slope, creek, marsh, watercourse, or other natural land form feature

Applicant response: The current approved PUD Development Plan has identified the Tract E school site and the neighborhood B and C multi-family sites as appropriate for development. The proposed application essentially swaps the location of the school site and the Neighborhood C multi-family area locations. The level of disturbance to these respective sites will remain the same. This application will not alter any of these landforms above and beyond the current approval. The cabin is existing and the landscape improvements associated with the proposed use would rehabilitate a disturbed environment.

By directly or indirectly affecting a wildlife habitat, feeding, or nesting ground;

Applicant response: The majority of the Haymeadow lands exist as irrigated and cultivated agricultural lands, which are not classified by the CDOW as wildlife habitat. However, the northern undisturbed natural lands are classified as habitat. The proximity of homes on Haymeadow could possibly affect this northern wildlife habitat. A complete wildlife analysis was included in the 2014 application and includes a comprehensive analysis of wildlife habitats and potential Haymeadow impacts and improvements, and includes a recommendation for a wildlife movement corridor across the eastern portion of the site. This recommendation, among others, has been incorporated into the Haymeadow design. The comprehensive report allowed for a thorough review and understanding of wildlife associated issues. The approved Haymeadow PUD includes wildlife mitigation measures to address potential impacts. The proposed application essentially swaps the location of the school site and the Neighborhood C multi-family area locations. The level of disturbance to these respective sites will remain the same and will not create any additional affect to wildlife habitat, feeding or nesting areas. If anything, the inclusion of the Soleil buffer will provide an additional wildlife corridor not contemplated in the approved Haymeadow PUD. The large scale event use of the cabin will be limited to the months of May through October and is consistent with an already approved use in the PUD. Furthermore, the substantial investment in improving the cabin would encourage the developer to cluster the Neighborhood D density further from the cabin and closer to Neighborhood B, which would provide a long-term benefit to wildlife. The cabin is adjacent and proximate to the Neighborhood D area.

By substantially altering or removing native grasses, trees, shrubs, or other vegetative cover;

Applicant response: The majority of the Haymeadow lands exist as irrigated and cultivated agricultural lands. Neither Tract E or Neighborhood C include native vegetation. The Haymeadow plan will not result in the substantial alteration of native vegetative cover. The level of disturbance



to these respective sites will remain the same regardless of whether the use is multi-family or school. This application will not alter any of this vegetative cover above and beyond the current approval. The area around the cabin has been disturbed by the residential use, the proposed landscape plan will eliminate non-native weeds.

By affecting the appearance or character of a significant scenic area or resource, or involving buildings or other structures that are of a size, bulk, or scale that would be in marked contrast to natural or existing cultural features;

Applicant response: The proposed PUD Amendment will not affect these factors above and beyond the current approval. These lands are located within the Eagle Area Community Plan Urban Growth Boundary and as such a certain level of impact to the above factors is understood.

By potentially resulting in avalanche, landslide, siltation, settlement, flood, or other land-form change of hazard to health and safety;

Applicant response: This application will not affect these factors.

By discharging toxic or thermally abnormal substance or involving use of herbicides or pesticides, or emitting smoke, gas, steam, dust, or other particulate matter;

Applicant response: This application will not change the approved PUD in any manner that will affect these factors.

By involving any process which results in odor that may be objectionable or damaging;

Applicant response: This application will not create any odor issues.

By requiring any waste treatment, cooling, or settlement pond, or requiring transportation of solid or liquid wastes to a treatment or disposal site;

Applicant response: This application will not change the approved PUD in any manner that will affect these factors.

By discharging significant volumes of solid or liquid wastes;

Applicant response: This application will not change the approved PUD in any manner that will affect these factors..

By increasing the demand on existing or planned sewage disposal, storm drainage, water distribution system, streets, or other utility systems to a level which is likely to cause an adverse impact on the environment

Applicant response: This application will not change the approved PUD in any manner that will affect these factors.

By involving any process which generates noise that may be offensive or damaging;

Applicant response: This application will not change the approved PUD in any manner that will affect these factors.

By either displacing significant numbers of people or resulting in a significant increase in population;

Applicant response: This application will not displace any people or result in any increase in population that is not already approved through the current PUD.

By pre-empting a site which is desirable for recreational uses or planned open space;

Applicant response: This application will not pre-empt a site desirable for recreational uses or as planned open space. The haymaker Trail is immediately proximate to the cabin and a portion of the trail will be slightly re-routed to provide a better trail and cabin experience.

By altering local traffic patterns or causing an increase in traffic volume or transit service need;

Applicant response: This application may slightly alter local traffic patterns. A trip distribution analysis has been included with this application for review.

By substantially affecting the revenues or expenditures of the Town government

Applicant response: This application will substantially increase near-term revenues of the Town by accelerating the timing of the Haymeadow buildout which will result in impact fees paid sooner, as well as accelerating the addition of resident taxpayers to the Town.

By increasing the demand on existing or planned school facilities to a level which is likely to cause an adverse impact on such school facilities, an adverse impact on educational opportunities, or an adverse impact on the revenues and expenditures of the Eagle County School District RE 50-J.

Applicant response: This application will not increase demand on school facilities, educational opportunities or ECSD revenues. The plan includes the relocation dedication of approximately eighteen acres of land to be dedicated to the school district for the location of a new K-8th grade school facility.

By being a part of a larger project which, at any future stage, may involve any of the impacts listed above.

Applicant response: The application is a part of a larger project that has been reviewed and approved by the Town of Eagle. The Haymeadow PUD is a complete master planned community and has addressed all of the elements associated with the anticipated build-out of the property.



APPENDIX A DRAFT REVISED PUD GUIDE



FIRST AMENDED
PUD GUIDE FOR
THE HAYMEADOW PLANNED UNIT
DEVELOPMENT

Amended and Approved,
(new date)

(February 18 revision draft)

Formatted: Centered

Deleted: ¶
March 25, 2014¶

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Centered

This document supersedes and replaces the Haymeadow PUD Guide dated March 25, 2014.

APPROVAL OF THIS PLAN CONSTITUTES A VESTED PROPERTY RIGHT
PURSUANT TO SECTION 24-68-103,C.R.S., AS AMENDED

1. PURPOSE:

The purpose of the Haymeadow PUD Guide is to serve as the governing land use regulations which will control the development of the Haymeadow PUD. The PUD Guide will serve as the “Zone District Regulations” for the PUD and is in conformance with Section 4.11.030 of the Town of Eagle Land Use and Development Code.

The Haymeadow PUD authorizes a total of 837 dwelling units, a public school facility, a fire station, active and passive parks and recreation areas, community facilities, trails and open space on 660 acres of land within the Town of Eagle, Eagle County, Colorado as described in the approved Haymeadow PUD Development Plan. Development within the PUD is administered by the Town of Eagle through the provisions of the PUD Development Plan and this PUD Guide. Building construction within the PUD is governed by the applicable Town of Eagle ordinances, rules, regulations and codes. Approval of this plan constitutes a vested property right pursuant to section 24-68-103,C.R.S., as amended.

The approved Haymeadow PUD Development Plan Drawing dated March 25, 2014 is attached to this PUD Guide as Exhibit A.

2. DEFINITIONS:

Unless otherwise defined below, all terms used in this document shall be as defined by the Town of Eagle Land Use Regulations.

A. Haymeadow PUD

The Haymeadow PUD is a zone district authorized by the Town of Eagle Ordinance No. _____, Series of 2014, and containing the property commonly known as Haymeadow.

B. Bed and Breakfast

An owner occupied dwelling unit that contains no more than four guest rooms where lodging, with or without meals, is provided for compensation.

C. Neighborhood Parcels

Areas as indicated on the approved Haymeadow PUD Development Plan for residential development, the development of which shall be regulated by this Haymeadow PUD Guide. These parcels are listed as Neighborhood A1, Neighborhood A2, Neighborhood B, Neighborhood C and Neighborhood D.

D. Planning Tracts

Areas as indicated on the approved Haymeadow PUD Development Plan and Preliminary Subdivision Plan for non-residential development, the development of which shall be regulated by this Haymeadow PUD Guide. These Tracts are listed as Tract E:

Recreation/School, Tract F: Park, Tract G: Fire Station, Tract I: Cabin, Tract J: School and Tract H: Future Development. The future resubdivision of Tract K will create additional tracts regulated by the PUD Guide. The Preliminary Plan is attached as Exhibit B.

E. Special Use

Special Use shall be as defined in Section 4.05 of the Town of Eagle Land Use and Development Code.

3. PUD ZONE DISTRICTS:

A. Residential One – Neighborhood Parcels A1, A2, B and C:

1. Purpose:
To provide sites for single family and multi-family homes on a variety of lot sizes that will maintain and reinforce the existing small town development pattern, character and architectural heritage of the Town of Eagle and to provide for mixed residential neighborhoods in order to serve the needs of the residents of Eagle. The design of neighborhoods in this district is intended to allow for flexibility, innovation and site sensitive planning that is responsive to both the design character and the functional requirements of the community.
2. Uses by Right:
 - a. One single family home on each specifically designated lot.
 - b. One duplex building (two units) on each specifically designated lot.
 - c. Multiple family residential, including condominiums, townhomes, flats or apartments, and single family or duplex cluster units on specifically designated lots.
 - d. Accessory apartment to single family dwelling as defined by the Town of Eagle (TOE) Municipal Code, not to exceed 700 square feet.
 - e. Utility service structures and buildings.
 - f. Home occupations as defined by the TOE Municipal Code.
 - g. Parks, open space and community gardens.
 - h. Model homes.
 - i. Pedestrian and bicycle trails.
 - j. Ponds, reservoirs and irrigation ditches.
 - k. Temporary construction staging areas.
 - l. Additional uses determined by the Town Planner to be similar to uses by right listed above.
 - m. Accessory uses customarily appurtenant to uses by right listed above including special events.
 - n. A Homeowner Association or Metro District operated or contracted enclosed storage building.
 - o. Typical agricultural uses may continue within each neighborhood until residential site development is initiated within the neighborhood.

- p. Mail box drop boxes or similar mail delivery facilities.
- q. Temporary sales office.

3. Special Uses:

- a. Day care of more than 8 children and elderly care.
- b. Special Events

4. Minimum Building Setback Requirements:

- a. Single family with front loaded garage:
 - 1. Front: 12.5 feet minimum setback to the front porch and /or front of the building facade. Porch steps may encroach up to 5 feet into the 12.5 foot required setback. The minimum distance from the front property line to a garage door shall be 25 feet. The maximum front setback for the front porch shall be 22 feet from the front property line.
 - 2. Side: 12.5 feet.
 - 3. Rear: 12.5 feet for one-story elements and 20 feet for two-story elements.
- b. Duplex with front loaded garage:
 - 1. Front: 12.5 feet minimum setback to the front porch and /or front of the building facade. Porch steps may encroach up to 3 feet into the 12.5 foot required setback. The maximum front setback for the front porch shall be 22 feet from the front property line. The minimum distance from the property line to a garage door facing a front property line shall be 25 feet.
 - 2. Side: 12.5 feet. The minimum distance from the side property line to a garage door shall be 33 feet for a lot with a shared driveway.
 - 3. Rear: 12.5 feet. An unenclosed, covered porch or deck may encroach up to 5 feet into the rear setback.
- c. Single family and duplex uses with alley loaded garage:
 - 1. Front: 12.5 feet to the front porch and /or front of the building facade. Porch steps may encroach up to 3 feet into the 12.5 foot required setback. The maximum front setback for the front porch shall be 22 feet from the front property line.
 - 2. Side: 12.5 feet
 - 3. Rear: 12.5 feet, however, the minimum distance from the property line to a garage door shall be 22 feet, or 24 feet to the alley travel way, whichever is more restrictive.
- d. Multiple Family:
 - 1. Front: 15 feet. The minimum distance from the front property line to a garage door shall be 25 feet.
 - 2. Side: 15 feet
 - 3. Rear: 20 feet
- e. Supplementary setback requirements:
 - 1. Roof eaves, bay window elements and similar features may encroach up to

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1", Hanging: 0.5", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single, No widow/orphan control, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

- 30 inches into any required setback.
2. Corner lots shall require compliance with the front setback standards on each side of the lot that fronts a public street.
3. There shall also be a 50 foot building setback from Sylvan Lake Road in Neighborhood A1 and A2.

Deleted: ¶

Page Break

5. Maximum Building Height:
35 feet.

6. Maximum Lot Coverage:
 - a. Residential Multi-Family
 1. Building 60%
 2. All impervious materials - 70%
 - b. Residential Single Family
 1. Building 40%
 2. All impervious materials - 60%

7. Maximum Density:
The maximum density shall not exceed 15 dwelling units per gross acre for development within any Multi-Family Tract as shown on the initial Final Plat for each Neighborhood.

8. Neighborhood A1 Core Trail:
The Multi-Family buildings in west/central area of Neighborhood A-1 shall be configured in such a manner to accommodate an alignment of the future 10 foot wide asphalt trail identified on the Neighborhood A-1, Phase 1 Trails Plan as described below.

This trail will serve as a main route for children to access the park site at a location close to the north side of the school's vehicular access system. This trail shall be configured to encourage use by children and designed in such a manner that provides direct views of the park site where possible and places a strong emphasis on safety at roadway crossings. This portion of the trail system will be approved by the Town as part of the Development Permit review process for the adjacent multi-family buildings and the trail shall be constructed concurrent with the multi-family units.

Deleted: school

Deleted: school

Deleted: school

Deleted: In the event construction is initiated on the school prior to completion of the trail, the developer shall cause completion of this trail prior to the opening of the school....

9. Supplemental requirements:
The minimum depth for first floor front porches shall be 7 feet.

B. Residential Two – Neighborhood D:

1. Purpose:
To provide sites for lower density single family homesites.
2. Uses by Right:
 - a. Single family dwelling units not to exceed 7,000 square foot maximum size.
 - b. Accessory apartment to single family dwelling as defined by the Town of Eagle Municipal Code, not to exceed 700 square feet.

Deleted: ¶

- c. Model homes.
 - d. Parks, open space and community gardens.
 - e. Home occupations.
 - f. Utility service structures and buildings/ maintenance facilities.
 - g. Pedestrian and bicycle trails.
 - h. Ponds, reservoirs and irrigation ditches.
 - i. Temporary construction staging areas.
 - j. Additional uses determined to be similar to uses by right listed above.
 - k. Accessory uses customarily appurtenant to uses by right listed above.
 - l. Accessory buildings may include detached garages, sheds and similar structures.
 - m. Temporary tree farm
 - n. Typical agricultural uses may continue within the neighborhood until residential site development is initiated.
 - o. Mail box drop boxes or similar mail delivery facilities.
 - p. Temporary sales office.
3. Special Uses:
- a. Day care of more than 8 children and elderly care.
 - b. Bed and breakfast.
 - c. Gravel borrow pit for on-site use.
 - d. Special Events
4. Minimum Building Setback Requirements:
- a. Front: 25 feet
 - b. Side: 15 feet
 - c. Rear: 20 feet.
5. Supplementary setback requirements:
- a. Corner lots shall require compliance with the front setback standards on each side of the lot that fronts a public street.
 - b. Roof eaves, bay window elements and similar features may encroach up to 30 inches into any required setback.
 - c. All garage doors shall be a minimum of 25 feet from the facing property line.
6. Maximum Building Height:
35 feet.
7. Maximum Lot Coverage:
- a. Building - 30%
 - b. All impervious materials - 50%
8. Building Envelopes:
The Subdivision Final Plat or Plats for Neighborhood D shall contain appropriate notations requiring building envelopes to be designated on certain lots prior to any site grading or other disturbance of the designated lot. Specifically, any lot over 1/2 acre shall be limited to a building envelope of 15,000 square feet. Application(s) for Subdivision

Final Plat shall include a supplemental exhibit specifying lots requiring building envelopes. Upon approval of such supplemental exhibit by the Town Planner, any modification of such supplemental exhibit shall require approval from the Town. The owner of such lot shall propose a building envelope as part of the application for design review and building permit. The proposed building envelope shall comply with all criteria affecting building envelopes contained in the Design Guidelines as approved by the Town, and shall be so indicated graphically on a landscape/ site plan. This landscape/site plan shall also include calculations to indicate the building envelope does not exceed 15,000 sq. ft. The Town reserves the right not to issue a building or site improvement permit until a building envelope, if required, that complies with all approved Design Guideline criteria has been approved by the Design Review Committee.

As used in this document, the term "building envelope" shall be deemed to include the residence, any allowable accessory buildings, driveways, walkways, patios, and landscaped areas.

All portions of a lot outside of the designated 15,000 square foot building envelope shall maintain the existing pasture grasses or be landscaped in a dryland, native or xeric style that requires minimal irrigation. Any landscaping of this area shall require approval by the DRB.

9. Wildlife Corridor and Berm:

At the time of the first subdivision plat for Neighborhood D a 500 foot wide wildlife corridor shall be established on the adjacent open space to the east of Neighborhood D, as indicated on the approved PUD Development Plan attached as Exhibit A. If at this time a corresponding 500 foot wide wildlife corridor has not been provided or committed on the adjacent Adam Rib Ranch property, then a 1000 foot wide corridor is required on the Haymeadow Planned Unit Development. At the time of this final plat a deed restriction shall be placed on this wildlife corridor to guarantee its protection. This corridor shall be maintained in agricultural production.

The construction of a landscape screening berm shall be included in the public improvements for Neighborhood D. The purpose of this landscape screening berm is to provide visual buffer between the animals using the wildlife corridor and the activity associated with Neighborhood D. The final plat or deed restriction will include language that ensures this landscape screen/ berm is a permanent landscape feature. A conceptual graphic that illustrates the intent of the landscape berm is attached as Exhibit C.

C. Recreation Open Space – Tract E, Town of Eagle Recreation Site:

1. Purpose:
To provide a land area for a recreation site to be dedicated to the Town of Eagle.
2. Uses by Right:
 - a. Indoor and outdoor recreation and entertainment facilities.
 - b. Parks and picnic facilities.
 - c. Community Center.
 - d. Cultural and educational buildings and activities.
 - e. Concessions, food and beverage service.
 - f. Special events including sports events and tournaments, entertainment and cultural events.
 - g. Public Administration building.
 - h. Administration/Maintenance facilities.
 - i. Equestrian, pedestrian and bicycle trails.
 - j. Dog park.
 - k. Community gardens.
 - l. Playgrounds, play equipment and water features.
 - m. Temporary structures, tents and trailers associated with special events.
 - n. Landscape improvements.
 - o. Lakes, ponds, reservoirs and irrigation ditches
 - ~~p.~~ Special events utilizing either indoor or outdoor facilities of the ~~park~~, including sporting, cultural or entertainment events.
 - ~~q.~~ Temporary construction/administration office.
 - ~~r.~~ Agricultural uses.
 - ~~s.~~ Public or private roads and utilities including bridges, utility, improvements, lines and mains, facilities, services and buildings.
 - ~~t.~~ Additional uses determined to be similar to uses by right listed above.
3. Minimum Building Setback Requirement:
There shall be a 25 foot building setback from all lot lines that front public roads, except from Sylvan lake Road where a 50 foot setback shall be required. From other lot lines there shall be no minimum except must be sufficient to accommodate utilities, drainage, access, fire and building code regulations.
4. Maximum Building Height:
35 Feet. Architectural features such as a tower, cupola or other architectural focal point may have a maximum height of 42 feet if approved by the Haymeadow Design Review Board.
5. Density Allowance:
N/A
6. Maximum Site Coverage:
N/A

Deleted: /School

Deleted: and School

Deleted: and a school site

Deleted: p.→ Public and/or Private School and related ancillary facilities, which may include, but not be limited to, classrooms, common areas, gymnasiums, cafeterias, theatres, offices, meeting rooms, parking, and outdoor recreation and athletic facilities. A bus barn or overnight vehicle storage area would not be considered a use-by-right.

Deleted: q

Deleted: school

Deleted: r

Deleted: s

Deleted: t

Deleted: u

D. Natural Open Space Tracts - OS-A, OS-B & OS-C, as labeled on the Preliminary Subdivision Plan, as well as future open space Tracts which will be created through resubdivision of Tract H of the PUD Preliminary Subdivision Plan. The approved PUD Development Plan depicts the general location and size of the future Open Space and Neighborhood areas within Tract H. The PUD Preliminary Subdivision Plan is attached as Exhibit B.

1. Purpose:
To provide sites for natural open space, active recreation, agricultural uses, trails and park facilities, water storage and drainage improvements and landscape improvements.
2. Uses by Right:
 - a. Equestrian, pedestrian and bicycle trails.
 - b. Landscape Improvements.
 - c. Lakes, ponds, reservoirs and irrigation ditches.
 - d. Shade shelters and picnic facilities.
 - e. Public or private roads, trailhead parking, restrooms, and utilities including bridges and utility improvements, tanks, lines, mains, pumphouses, facilities, services and buildings.
 - f. Agricultural uses and associated facilities.
 - g. Community gardens and associated facilities.
 - h. Dog parks.
 - i. Special events associated with agricultural facilities, community garden facilities, trails and trailheads, such as athletic, entertainment or cultural events.
3. Building Setback requirement
25 feet
4. Maximum Building Height
35 feet
5. Gross Density Allowance:
N/A
6. Maximum Site Coverage:
N/A
7. Supplemental Requirements:
The design and placement of recreation trails adjacent to the eastern wildlife corridor and open space shall minimize the impact of recreation users upon wildlife.

Deleted: j. Weddings and community events hosted at the existing cabin and the surrounding area, which shall include the right to improve said structure and seasonally install an outdoor tent from May through October.

E. Fire Station - Tract G:

1. Purpose:
To provide a site for a fire station and related improvements.
2. Uses by Right:
 - a. Fire station and related ancillary facilities, which may include, but not be limited to, offices, meeting rooms, training areas, crew quarters and temporary residences for fire fighters.
 - b. Additional uses determined to be similar to uses by right listed above.
 - c. Accessory uses customarily appurtenant to uses by right listed above.
3. Building Setback Requirement:
There shall be a 25' building setback from all lot lines.
4. Maximum Building Height:
35 feet. Architectural features such as a tower, cupola or other architectural focal point may have a maximum height of 42 feet if approved by the Haymeadow Design Review Board.
5. Haymeadow DRB approval and Town of Eagle Development Permit approval will be required prior to construction of buildings or alteration of the site.

F. Trailhead Park – Tract F

1. Purpose:
To provide a site for active park and recreation facilities, formal and informal play fields, open space, ponds and water features, stream corridors and recreation trails, community buildings and facilities.
2. Uses by Right:
 - a. Indoor and outdoor recreation and entertainment facilities.
 - b. Parks and picnic facilities.
 - c. Community Center.
 - d. Cultural and educational buildings and activities.
 - e. Concessions, food and beverage service.
 - f. Special events including sports events and tournaments, entertainment and cultural events.
 - g. Administration/Maintenance facilities.
 - h. Homeowner Association or Metro District operated or contracted enclosed storage or administration building.
 - i. Equestrian, pedestrian and bicycle trails.
 - j. Dog park.
 - k. Community gardens.
 - l. Playgrounds, play equipment and water features.
 - m. Temporary structures, tents and trailers associated with special events.

- n. Landscape improvements.
 - o. Lakes, ponds, reservoirs, raw water irrigation structures and facilities and irrigation ditches.
 - p. Temporary construction/administration/sales office. Public or private roads and utilities including bridges, utility, improvements, lines and mains, facilities, services and buildings.
 - q. Agricultural uses.
 - r. Additional uses determined by the Town Planner to be similar to uses by right listed above.
3. Building Setback Requirement:
There shall be a 25' building setback from all lot lines.
4. Maximum Building Height:
35 feet. Architectural features such as a tower, cupola or other architectural focal point may have a maximum height of 42 feet if approved by the Haymeadow Design Review Board.

G. Cabin – Tract I

1. Purpose:

To provide a venue for special events including but not limited to weddings, community and corporate events including overnight stays by guests for no more than two consecutive nights.

2. Uses by Right:

- a. Cabin with kitchen, bathrooms and dressing/bedroom rooms.
- b. Indoor and outdoor special events limited to a maximum of 170 attendees.
- c. Landscape Improvements
- d. Seasonal tents for special events
- e. Parking for no more than 20 vehicles
- f. Portable self contained restrooms.
- g. Equestrian, bicycle and pedestrian trails.

3. Building setback requirement: 25 feet from all lot lines

4. Maximum Building Height 24 feet

5. Gross Density Allowance: One Dwelling Unit not to exceed 2,500 square feet

6. Maximum site coverage: N/A

7. Supplementary Regulations:

- a. Special Events utilizing outdoor space shall not be allowed on a seasonal basis between the dates of December 1 to May 15.
- b. No amplified music shall be allowed between the hours of 11:00 pm and 9:00 am.
- c. Water and wastewater connection to the cabin shall be completed at the time those utilities are extended into Neighborhood D.
- d. Special Event parking for events larger than 20 attendees shall be accommodated on ABRIKA owned Haymeadow property or guests shall be shuttled in from private offsite locations. No off-site parking in public parking lots or on Town of Eagle property or road right of ways shall be permitted.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Times

Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 0.75"

H. School – Tract J

Formatted: Font: Bold

8. Purpose:

To provide a land for a school site to be dedicated to the Eagle County School District.

9. Uses by Right:

h. Public and /or private school and related ancillary facilities, which may include but not limited to, classrooms, common areas, gymnasiums, cafeterias, theaters, offices, meeting rooms, parking and outdoor recreation, athletic and teaching facilities. A bus barn or dedicated overnight vehicle storage would not be considered a use-by-right..

i. Indoor and outdoor special events.

10. Building setback requirement: 25 feet from all lot lines

Maximum Building Height 35 feet.. Architectural features such as a tower, cupola or other architectural focal point may have a maximum height of 42 feet if approved by the Haymeadow Design Review Board.

11. Gross Density Allowance: N/A

12. Maximum site coverage: N/A

4. DENSITY CONTROL

Allowable maximum densities for each Neighborhood Parcel are set forth within the following density chart; provided however, that any Neighborhood Parcel may contain up to 1.25 times the total number of allowable dwelling units as described below. Any such increase in density of a Neighborhood Parcel shall be offset by an equal decrease in density from another Neighborhood Parcel. The intent of this provision is to allow flexibility in planning to take into account varying site conditions, market conditions and other design factors. There shall be no transfer of density allowed into Neighborhood D.

In no event shall the total number of residential units in all planning parcels within the Haymeadow PUD combined exceed 837 units. Accessory dwelling units not exceeding seven hundred (700) square feet appurtenant to single family dwellings shall not be included in such limitation.

The combination of two or more existing residential units into a lesser number of units shall first be approved by the Haymeadow Design Review Board and the Town Planner if any of such units have been designated as an affordable housing unit pursuant to the Town of Eagle Local Employee Residence Program. Approval by the Town shall be granted if such combination is in conformance with this PUD Guide and any applicable building codes.

However, residential units designated as affordable housing units shall not be combined if such combination would reduce the total number of affordable housing units below the minimum number of required affordable housing units required under the Town's Local Employee Residence Program.

The Haymeadow Homeowners (Design Review Board) and the Town of Eagle shall have all remedies available to them at law or in equity to enforce the provisions of this Section.

Accompanying each Final Plat and Development Permit application shall be an inventory of dwelling units that have been approved by previously final plats and/or Development Permits for each respective Neighborhood.

Neighborhood	Single Family/Duplex	Multi-Family	Total # D.U.
A1	82	258	340
A2	103	86	189
B	161	0	161
C	97	0	97
D	50	0	50
TOTAL	493	344	837

Deleted: 146

Deleted: 228

Deleted: 48

Deleted: 209

Deleted: 64

Deleted: 161

Density within each neighborhood has been defined in the PUD Development Plan and the PUD Guide as two unit types: Multi-Family and Single Family/Duplex. Up to 25% of the units identified as Multi-Family may be converted to Single Family/Duplex units and allowed in areas referenced as Multi-Family on the PUD Zoning Plan. No additional density beyond the 837 approved units is allowed.

5. PARKING REQUIREMENTS

All uses within Haymeadow will be subject to the parking standards of the Town of Eagle Land Use & Development Code with the following exceptions. Any on-street parking spaces shall be constructed as guest or park parking and may not be counted toward fulfilling residential parking requirements. Each single-family or duplex residence shall have a minimum of two on site parking spaces in addition to any garage space. These parking spaces shall fit within the property and not overhang any public walkway or travel way. Any accessory dwelling associated within a single family residence shall have one dedicated on-site parking space. A Bed and Breakfast use as defined in this PUD Guide shall provide the required single family parking plus one additional parking space per guest room.

6. DESIGN REVIEW

Design guidelines shall be prepared which will establish architectural and building material standards, landscape design, urban design, site design standards and a design review process for development within Haymeadow. These guidelines shall be approved and in place for any area of the Haymeadow PUD prior to the approval of any Subdivision Final Plat for that area. The Design Guidelines shall be submitted to the Town for review and approval by the Town Board using the Major Development Permit Review process. Subsequent major revisions to the

guidelines shall be subject to the same review and approval process of the Town of Eagle.

The Haymeadow Home Owners Association shall establish a Haymeadow Design Review Board that shall have authority and responsibility over the design review process. In the event that the Haymeadow Design Review Board ceases to fulfill its duties as described in the guidelines the Town of Eagle may assume the role of the Design Review Board.

All projects requiring a Town of Eagle permit shall adhere to the standards of this PUD and, where not specifically covered, the provisions of the Town of Eagle Land Use Code.

Applicants for all new development proposals, new buildings or building modifications, new landscaping or landscaping modifications, as defined in the adopted design guidelines, shall submit such proposals for review and approval by the Design Review Board.

The Town of Eagle shall not issue a building permit or grading permit without prior approval by the Design Review Board as demonstrated by drawings stamped as approved by the Design Review Board.

1. **Architectural Design Standards:**

The site design concept for Haymeadow, and for Neighborhood A in particular, is to create pedestrian friendly, walkable well-connected neighborhoods. A streetscape plan that includes a wide planting strip with street trees and sidewalks along both sides of the street will frame the residential development.

In the single family and duplex neighborhoods relatively narrow lots with uniform building setbacks, recessed garages and a well-established front porch element will create a strong neighborhood pattern. As the development progresses into Neighborhoods B, C and D the approved PUD Development Plan density decreases and the narrow lot pattern and streetscape design may become more relaxed.

Multi-family buildings will also be oriented to respect the streetscape while providing off-street parking. The buildings will be arranged to also focus on courtyard and open space access that will maintain a less formal but equally inviting pedestrian neighborhood quality.

The architecture of the Haymeadow community will both integrate with and enhance the beauty of the Town of Eagle and the Brush Creek valley. The intended goal is to develop a series of neighborhoods at ease with the surrounding ranching setting that look and feel like a natural evolution of the greater Eagle community. This will be assured through the development, adoption and enforcement of design guidelines that:

- a. Establish design and construction standards that both fit in the setting and ensure a consistent high level of quality across a wide array of housing types;
- b. Respond to the unique attributes and sensitivities of the site which are reflected in the design tenets underlying the plan;
- c. Implement a diverse but cohesive, unified and balanced architectural and landscape theme;

- d. Control massing of buildings to be appropriate in scale and context;
- e. Site structures in a manner which responds to existing physical site features, maximizes vistas, privacy and addresses energy usage ;
- f. Utilize forms and materials that honor the site's cultural history.

The Applicant has begun to develop housing designs that are illustrative of its vision for the property and are attached as Exhibit D.

These illustrative drawings:

- are examples of the type and style of housing that can be achieved in each residential building type. The architectural character will offer variety but will also include a style that ties together the single family and multi-family building types;
- reflect the general design principals outlined above which are the framework to be expanded upon and implemented in future design guidelines.

The architecture of the Haymeadow Community is inspired by the natural materials and simple gathered forms of the surrounding historic Colorado ranch compounds. These typical asymmetric historic buildings which evolved over time have a casual and intimate architecture which is at harmony with the land. The proposed palette of natural earth colored stucco, timbers and stained wood sidings will give the buildings a natural patina that will blend in with the surroundings. The architecture of the community will be rooted in the history of the place.

The main element of the house should typically be two stories in height and typically have gable roof(s) with smaller attached one-story elements with typical shed roofs. Buildings are generally taller in the middle and step down at ends with typically one and a half story massing at the sides of the house and should step with grade to minimize site grading.

Primary building materials/colors must be muted tones derived from the earth, trees and rock outcroppings of the surroundings environment.

2. Environmental Building Practices:

- a. Low environmental impact and energy efficiency approaches to site planning, design, landscaping and construction are highly encouraged.
- b. Owners are encouraged to review LEED guidelines published by the US Green Building Council (www.usgbc.org) which encourage energy efficiency, resource efficiency and healthy indoor air quality.
- c. Passive and active solar is highly encouraged. Hot water and photo voltaic solar panels are encouraged to be well planned and integrated in to the architectural design. Panels should be installed in the same plane as the roofs and close to flush with the roof. Solar panels and all associated mounting brackets and hardware shall be all black. No bright shiny metal elements are allowed.

3. **Landscape Design Standards:**

Landscape Design Standards will be written and adopted as an integral part of the overall design guidelines. The intent of the landscape design guidelines will be provide standards for landscaping and water conservation within the PUD that enhance and maintain the character of the residential neighborhoods and public spaces of the Haymeadow PUD. The Landscape Design Guidelines shall comply with the Town of Eagle Water Efficiency & Conservation plan as applicable. This will be accomplished by:

- a. Setting minimum and maximum standards for planting within residential and public spaces.
- b. Promoting the conservation of water through selection of proper plant palettes and the use of efficient irrigation techniques.
- c. Controlling the spread of noxious weeds and invasive plant species.

4. **Illumination Design Standards:**

Illumination design standards for residential and public uses shall be included within the approved design guidelines. The intent of these standards will be to provide compliance with adopted Town of Eagle lighting requirements and appropriate dark sky practices.

5. **Fencing Design Standards:**

Fencing design standards shall be included within the approved design guidelines. The intent of these standards will be to provide a compatible appearance among residential properties and to regulate the structure, location, height, color and materials of fencing prior to installation. Where appropriate and as required, wildlife friendly fencing will be specified.

6. **Specific Design Considerations:**

Specific design considerations have been discussed with the Town of Eagle through the Haymeadow PUD Development Plan approval process. This section of the PUD provides a commitment to incorporate certain design considerations into the Haymeadow Design Guidelines.

- a. Final Plat and Development Permit applications shall include site and landscape design considerations for each Sylvan Lake Road intersection that creates key visual corridors into the adjacent neighborhood, creating a sense of welcome and entry. This is of specific importance at the school road intersection.
- b. Any development plan that includes a enclosed storage building or a HOA/Metro District maintenance yard shall include appropriate landscape screening to screen the view from the public street. Any yard and building plan structures shall require approval of the Haymeadow Design Review Board.
- c. Cedar or other wood shake shingle products shall not be allowed as a roofing material.
- d. Multi-Family development and Fire Station shall be subject to Town of Eagle Development Permit review as outlined in Section 4.06 of the Town of Eagle Land Use and Development Code.

7. SIGNS

Sign regulations shall meet the Town of Eagle sign code; unless a comprehensive Haymeadow Sign Program is approved by the Town of Eagle.

8. DOGS AND PET CONTROL

Each dwelling unit will be permitted to house up to two dogs and offspring up to three months old. Residents will be prohibited from harboring dogs on their property unless they have adequate facilities (i.e., animals kept in residence, a fenced yard, an electronically fenced yard, dog run, or kennel) to contain the animals. Enclosed runs must be located immediately adjacent to the home, within the lot's building envelope if an envelope is required, and shall not exceed 1,000 square feet. If facilities are inadequate to contain the dog(s), the animals will be immediately removed from the subdivision until adequate structures can be built.

At no time are dogs to be allowed to run freely, other than within designated leash free dog parks. Haymeadow shall be subject to any and all leash laws and other pet regulations as adopted by the Town of Eagle.

Stray dogs may also be controlled by the Town and/or County and Colorado Department of Parks and Wildlife (CDPW). Homeowners not in compliance with these dog restrictions will be responsible for any and all costs incurred by the Town, County, and/or CDPW for enforcing these provisions.

Contractors, subcontractors and other construction related visitors shall be prohibited from bringing dogs onto the Haymeadow PUD.

9. FENCING

Any fencing separating a residential lot from adjacent natural open space shall be required to meet the wildlife friendly fencing guidelines of Colorado Parks and Wildlife.

The Haymeadow Metro District and/or Homeowners Association shall be responsible for maintaining a fence at appropriate perimeter sections of the PUD to keep cattle grazing on adjacent lands from entering the Haymeadow PUD.

10. TOWN OF EAGLE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

All multi-family buildings, the fire station, school and Trailhead Park pavilion building shall be required to obtain a Development Permit pursuant to Section 4.06 of the Town of Eagle Land Use and Development Code

11 TRASH RECEPTACLES

Single family residences within the Haymeadow PUD shall be restricted from storing or leaving

trash receptacles outside overnight. Trash receptacles shall be placed outside on the day of pick-up and shall be returned to an indoor location the same day.

Multi-family buildings shall provide wildlife resistant trash enclosure structures consistent with the approved Design Guidelines.

12. CONFLICTS

The specific provisions of this Guide shall supersede those of the Town of Eagle Land Use Regulations. However, where the Guide does not address an issue, the specific provisions of the Town of Eagle Land Use Regulations shall prevail. In cases of dispute or ambiguity, the Board of Trustees shall act to interpret.

13. AMENDMENTS TO THE HAYMEADOW PUD GUIDE, PUD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND SUBDIVISION PLANS

It is anticipated that modifications or amendments to this PUD Guide, the PUD Development Plan, and Subdivision Plans will be necessary from time to time as Haymeadow progresses. This PUD Guide provides for two types of modifications or amendments: minor and major.

A. Minor Modifications:

Minor modifications are those changes which will not alter the original project concept but which may result in minor changes in the design of Haymeadow. Minor modifications include, but are not limited to internal road alignment alterations, minor adjustments to parcel boundaries, building envelope changes, and additions of land uses not previously listed but determined to be similar to listed uses. Minor adjustments to Planning Parcel boundaries shall be defined as:

Change in land use of a parcel of property not to exceed 20,000 square feet to conform to the land use of property immediately adjacent to it, provided however, that the provisions of this article shall not apply to property adjacent to any parcel of property the land use of which has previously been changed pursuant to the provisions of this article. Minor modification shall also include any decrease in size of a Neighborhood Residential parcel that is offset by an equal increase in an open space parcel.

Minor modifications may be authorized by the Town of Eagle Zoning Administrator upon written request. The Zoning Administrator shall act upon any minor modification request within 30 days of such a request. Any decision by the Zoning Administrator may be appealed in writing to the Eagle Board of Trustees within 30 days of such decision.

B. Major Modifications:

Major modifications are those changes not considered to be minor modifications and are changes that could alter the character or land use of a portion of the project.

Major modifications shall include:

1. Any increase in the total number of residential units.
2. Any change in land use designation of any parcels within the PUD, except as provided above.
3. Any additional of land into the PUD.

Major modifications shall be under the authority of the Eagle Board of Trustees. Applications for major modifications shall be heard in public hearing by the Board after receiving a recommendation from the Planning and Zoning commission. The Town Board shall approve the modification if it is found that the modification is consistent with the efficient development of the entire PUD and does not substantially affect the enjoyment of land abutting the PUD or the public interest.

Approved by Abrika Properties, LLC, the developer of the Haymeadow PUD, this _____ day of _____, 2014.

By: _____

TOWN of EAGLE Signature block:

Approved by the TOWN OF EAGLE, COLORADO, a municipal corporation acting by and through its Board of Trustees, this _____ day of _____, 2014.

_____, Mayor

ATTEST:

Town Clerk

APPENDIX B **MCDOWELL ENGINEERING, LLC TRAFFIC MEMORANDUM**



Traffic Memorandum

To: Brandon Cohen
Abrika Properties, LLC
8250 SW 27th Avenue
Ocala, FL 34476

From: Kari J. McDowell Schroeder, PE, PTOE

Date: October 16, 2020

Re: **Haymeadow School Site Swap – Traffic Memo**
Eagle, Colorado

Abrika Properties, the developer of Haymeadow, is proposing to swap two land uses internal to the Haymeadow site. The development's current school site is located adjacent to the Town of Eagle's Pool and Ice Rink facility, on the northwest corner of the Haymeadow site. The applicant is proposing to swap the location of the school site with 112 multifamily units located on the northeast of Brush Creek Road and Ouzel Lane. The Town Park use will remain adjacent to the Pool and Ice Rink facility. **Figure 1** shows the site location of the proposed land use swap.




Figure 1: Proposed Land Use Swap

Project Background

The Town of Eagle previously approved a Transportation Impact Study¹ (TIS) for the Haymeadow development. Data and recommendations from this TIS are referenced in this analysis of traffic impacts from the proposed school site swap.

Trip Generation Impacts

The anticipated trip generation for each site was taken from the TIS¹. Refer to **Table 1**.

Table 1: Original Trip Generation Analysis from TIS¹

PH0926 Hay Meadow Project 8/13/2013

Haymeadow Traffic Study

Table 2. Trip Generation Estimate for the Haymeadow Development and the Recreation Facility

Parcel	ITE Code	Land Use	Size	Unit	Trip Reduction Factors			Average Daily Trips		External A.M. Peak Hour Trips			External P.M. Peak Hour Trips					
					Multi-Modal	Internal Trips and Multi-Purpose Trips	Pace-By	Rate	Total Trips with No Trip Reductions	Total External Trips With Trip Reductions	Rate	Total	In	Out	Rate	Total	In	Out
School	520/522	K - 8 School (4)	400	Students	0.10	0.375	0.00	1.36	916	459	0.47	159	87	72	0.15	51	25	28
A1	210	Single Family Detached	67	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	9.57	641	579	0.75	25	11	34	1.01	61	30	23
A1	230	Townhome / Condo / Apt	140	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	820	740	0.44	58	9	47	0.52	80	44	22
A1	(2)	Accessory Dwelling Units	10	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	59	63	0.44	4	1	3	0.52	5	3	2
		Subtotal Parcel A1	217						1,520	1,372	1.05	21	84	132	85	47		
A2	210	Single Family Detached	90	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	9.57	861	777	0.75	31	15	48	1.01	92	52	30
A2	230	Townhome / Condo / Apt	93	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	545	462	0.44	37	5	31	0.52	44	29	15
A2	(2)	Accessory Dwelling Units	13	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	76	69	0.44	5	1	4	0.52	6	4	2
		Subtotal Parcel A2	196						1,482	1,308	1.03	22	81	132	85	47		
B	210	Single Family Detached	147	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	9.57	1,402	1,220	0.75	100	25	75	1.01	134	94	50
B	230	Townhome / Condo / Apt	46	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	281	254	0.44	19	3	18	0.52	23	15	8
B	(2)	Accessory Dwelling Units	22	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	129	116	0.44	9	1	9	0.52	10	7	3
		Subtotal Parcel B	217						1,817	1,640	1.29	29	89	107	106	63		
C	210	Single Family Detached	88	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	9.57	845	760	0.75	68	15	45	1.01	90	50	30
C	230	Townhome / Condo / Apt	94	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	375	339	0.44	25	4	21	0.52	30	20	10
C	(2)	Accessory Dwelling Units	13	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	76	69	0.44	5	1	4	0.52	6	4	2
		Subtotal Parcel C	195						1,295	1,167	1.00	90	20	70	116	74	42	
D	210	Single Family Detached	50	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	9.57	478	432	0.75	34	9	25	1.01	45	25	17
D	230	Townhome / Condo / Apt	0	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	0	0	0.44	0	0	0	0.52	0	0	0
D	(2)	Accessory Dwelling Units	8	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	47	42	0.44	3	0	3	0.52	4	3	1
		Subtotal Parcel D	58						526	474	1.00	37	9	28	50	32	18	
Civic	412	Community Park (3)	13	Acres	0.15	0.50	0.00	2.29	30	13	0.01	0	0	0	0.05	0	0	0
Civic	(1)	Fire Station	2	Acres	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	20	20	2.00	4	3	1	2.00	4	1	3
Total External Haymeadow Trip Ends:									7,504	6,483	626	191	435		682	408	244	
T.O.E. Rec.	495	Recreation Community Center	68	1,000 sq. ft.	0.10	0.10	0.00	14.00	952	771	1.02	89	54	35	1.45	90	30	50
T.O.E. Rec.	498	Soccer Complex	3	Fields	0.10	0.10	0.00	71.33	214	173	1.40	8	2	1	20.67	60	35	15
Total External Recreation Facility Trip Ends:									1,166	944	92	65	36		130	65	65	
Total External Trips From Both Sites:									8,670	7,427	718	247	471		782	473	309	

A comparison of the sites to be swapped results in a net increase of daily trips for Neighborhood A. However, peak morning hourly trips are anticipated to be higher at the new school site. A comparison of the trip generation is included in **Table 2**. These trip generation calculations are based upon ITE's national trip generation methods². Reductions were already taken in the TIS for the school site's multimodal (pedestrian and bicycle), internal Haymeadow trips, and multi-purpose trips.

Table 2: Summary of Original and Proposed Trips

Time	Weekday Trips (vpd)	Peak AM Trips Inbound (vph)	Peak AM Trips Outbound (vph)	Peak PM Trips Inbound (vph)	Peak PM Trips Outbound (vph)
Neighborhood A					
Original – School Site	-459	-87	-72	-25	-26
Proposed – 112 Multifamily	+592	+7	+37	+35	+18
Difference	+133	-80	-35	+10	-8
Neighborhood B & C					
Original – 112 Multifamily	-592	-7	-37	-35	-18
Proposed – School Site	+459	+87	+72	+25	+26
Difference	-133	+80	+35	-10	+8

vpd = vehicles per day; vph = vehicles per hour

The proposed land use swap results in the following changed in traffic patterns.

- Neighborhood A
 - o Net increase in daily trips of 133vpd. This increase is caused because residential units are more likely to travel throughout the day than school traffic. This daily traffic increase will not be as noticeable as hourly traffic increases.
 - o Decrease of 115vph in morning traffic. This is because residential traffic is less intensive in the morning than school traffic.
 - o Comparable (+2vph) evening peak hour traffic.
- Neighborhood B & C
 - o Net decrease in daily trips of 133vpd.
 - o Increase in morning traffic due to the school drop-off peak traffic. This is typically an intensive travel time for 20 – 30 minutes before school starts.
 - Extra 80vph inbound to the school.
 - Extra 35 vph leaving after school drop off.
 - o Comparable (-2vph) evening peak hour traffic.

² Trip Generation, 8th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2008.



The increase in daily traffic at Neighborhood A will not be noticeable on the roadway network. The daily traffic increase is anticipated because residential units are more likely to travel throughout the day than school traffic. Neighborhood A is not anticipated to see a significant impact in hourly travel.

The largest impact of the proposed land use swap is the additional 115vph caused by the morning school drop-off traffic on Neighborhood B. This traffic increase is typically caused by an intensive travel time for 20 – 30 minutes before school starts. This impact is discussed in detail below.

Morning School Traffic Impacts on Neighborhood B

The original TIS made a general assumption in applying the directional distribution of the site-generated traffic to the entire Haymeadow site. Each land use will have its own unique pattern of where cars are coming from and going to. For example, the elementary school portion of the school site will likely draw largely from the future Haymeadow residents. Therefore, the original TIS anticipated that 280 morning and 91 evening peak hour trips would be a combination of pedestrian, bicycle, internal Haymeadow trips, and multi-purpose trips such as a parent dropping off a student on their way to work. Haymeadow has incorporated numerous sidewalk and trail improvements into the development, increasing the likelihood of students walking and biking to school.

Transportation Infrastructure Impacts and Conclusion

The additional 115 vph (80vph in / 35vph out) during the school's morning drop-off caused by the school site swap would likely all be external trips, accessed by Sylvan Lake Road or Ouzel Lane.

It is likely that approximately 2/3 of the additional traffic (53vph in / 23vph out) to new school location will access the school site via Sylvan Lake Road, as it provides the fastest travel time from Eagle Ranch and the surrounding neighborhoods. This will only increase traffic on Sylvan Lake Road from the original school site to the new school site, as the traffic was previously accounted for at the original school site. The Sylvan Lake Road extension into the Haymeadow property was adequately designed with two 11' wide travel lanes and a 5-foot-wide paved shoulder on each side to serve as on-street bike lanes. The Sylvan Lake Road corridor will also include a separated 10-foot-wide bicycle/pedestrian path. This path will connect to the existing trails and sidewalks to the new Haymeadow development.

The remaining 1/3 of the additional morning traffic (27vph in / 12vph out) caused by the school site swap will likely access the school via Ouzel Lane. This may add to the southbound left turn movement from Brush Creek Road to Ouzel Lane towards the Haymeadow project. The configuration of the Brush Creek Road and Ouzel Lane intersection should be studied prior to the time of Final Plat.

The future school site should be designed to accommodate the anticipated queues within the school property. The configuration of the school site circulation will directly impact operations and travel on the adjacent street network. The school's proposed circulation and operations should be reviewed by the Town's Traffic Engineer.

Please call if you would like any additional information or have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,
McDowell Engineering, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kari J. McDowell Schroeder".

Kari J. McDowell, PE, PTOE
Senior Traffic & Transportation Engineer

FIRST AMENDED
PUD GUIDE FOR
THE HAYMEADOW PLANNED UNIT
DEVELOPMENT

Amended and Approved,
(new date)

(February 18 revision draft)

Formatted: Centered

Deleted: ¶
March 25, 2014¶

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Centered

This document supersedes and replaces the Haymeadow PUD Guide dated March 25, 2014.

APPROVAL OF THIS PLAN CONSTITUTES A VESTED PROPERTY RIGHT
PURSUANT TO SECTION 24-68-103,C.R.S., AS AMENDED

1. PURPOSE:

The purpose of the Haymeadow PUD Guide is to serve as the governing land use regulations which will control the development of the Haymeadow PUD. The PUD Guide will serve as the “Zone District Regulations” for the PUD and is in conformance with Section 4.11.030 of the Town of Eagle Land Use and Development Code.

The Haymeadow PUD authorizes a total of 837 dwelling units, a public school facility, a fire station, active and passive parks and recreation areas, community facilities, trails and open space on 660 acres of land within the Town of Eagle, Eagle County, Colorado as described in the approved Haymeadow PUD Development Plan. Development within the PUD is administered by the Town of Eagle through the provisions of the PUD Development Plan and this PUD Guide. Building construction within the PUD is governed by the applicable Town of Eagle ordinances, rules, regulations and codes. Approval of this plan constitutes a vested property right pursuant to section 24-68-103, C.R.S., as amended.

The approved Haymeadow PUD Development Plan Drawing dated March 25, 2014 is attached to this PUD Guide as Exhibit A.

2. DEFINITIONS:

Unless otherwise defined below, all terms used in this document shall be as defined by the Town of Eagle Land Use Regulations.

A. Haymeadow PUD

The Haymeadow PUD is a zone district authorized by the Town of Eagle Ordinance No. _____, Series of 2014, and containing the property commonly known as Haymeadow.

B. Bed and Breakfast

An owner occupied dwelling unit that contains no more than four guest rooms where lodging, with or without meals, is provided for compensation.

C. Neighborhood Parcels

Areas as indicated on the approved Haymeadow PUD Development Plan for residential development, the development of which shall be regulated by this Haymeadow PUD Guide. These parcels are listed as Neighborhood A1, Neighborhood A2, Neighborhood B, Neighborhood C and Neighborhood D.

D. Planning Tracts

Areas as indicated on the approved Haymeadow PUD Development Plan and Preliminary Subdivision Plan for non-residential development, the development of which shall be regulated by this Haymeadow PUD Guide. These Tracts are listed as Tract E:

Recreation/School, Tract F: Park, Tract G: Fire Station, Tract I; Cabin, Tract J; School and Tract H: Future Development. The future resubdivision of Tract K will create additional tracts regulated by the PUD Guide. The Preliminary Plan is attached as Exhibit B.

E. Special Use

Special Use shall be as defined in Section 4.05 of the Town of Eagle Land Use and Development Code.

3. PUD ZONE DISTRICTS:

A. Residential One – Neighborhood Parcels A1, A2, B and C:

1. Purpose:
To provide sites for single family and multi-family homes on a variety of lot sizes that will maintain and reinforce the existing small town development pattern, character and architectural heritage of the Town of Eagle and to provide for mixed residential neighborhoods in order to serve the needs of the residents of Eagle. The design of neighborhoods in this district is intended to allow for flexibility, innovation and site sensitive planning that is responsive to both the design character and the functional requirements of the community.
2. Uses by Right:
 - a. One single family home on each specifically designated lot.
 - b. One duplex building (two units) on each specifically designated lot.
 - c. Multiple family residential, including condominiums, townhomes, flats or apartments, and single family or duplex cluster units on specifically designated lots.
 - d. Accessory apartment to single family dwelling as defined by the Town of Eagle (TOE) Municipal Code, not to exceed 700 square feet.
 - e. Utility service structures and buildings.
 - f. Home occupations as defined by the TOE Municipal Code.
 - g. Parks, open space and community gardens.
 - h. Model homes.
 - i. Pedestrian and bicycle trails.
 - j. Ponds, reservoirs and irrigation ditches.
 - k. Temporary construction staging areas.
 - l. Additional uses determined by the Town Planner to be similar to uses by right listed above.
 - m. Accessory uses customarily appurtenant to uses by right listed above including special events.
 - n. A Homeowner Association or Metro District operated or contracted enclosed storage building.
 - o. Typical agricultural uses may continue within each neighborhood until residential site development is initiated within the neighborhood.

- p. Mail box drop boxes or similar mail delivery facilities.
- q. Temporary sales office.

3. Special Uses:

- a. Day care of more than 8 children and elderly care.
- b. Special Events

4. Minimum Building Setback Requirements:

- a. Single family with front loaded garage:
 - 1. Front: 12.5 feet minimum setback to the front porch and /or front of the building facade. Porch steps may encroach up to 5 feet into the 12.5 foot required setback. The minimum distance from the front property line to a garage door shall be 25 feet. The maximum front setback for the front porch shall be 22 feet from the front property line.
 - 2. Side: 12.5 feet.
 - 3. Rear: 12.5 feet for one-story elements and 20 feet for two-story elements.
- b. Duplex with front loaded garage:
 - 1. Front: 12.5 feet minimum setback to the front porch and /or front of the building facade. Porch steps may encroach up to 3 feet into the 12.5 foot required setback. The maximum front setback for the front porch shall be 22 feet from the front property line. The minimum distance from the property line to a garage door facing a front property line shall be 25 feet.
 - 2. Side: 12.5 feet. The minimum distance from the side property line to a garage door shall be 33 feet for a lot with a shared driveway.
 - 3. Rear: 12.5 feet. An unenclosed, covered porch or deck may encroach up to 5 feet into the rear setback.
- c. Single family and duplex uses with alley loaded garage:
 - 1. Front: 12.5 feet to the front porch and /or front of the building facade. Porch steps may encroach up to 3 feet into the 12.5 foot required setback. The maximum front setback for the front porch shall be 22 feet from the front property line.
 - 2. Side: 12.5 feet
 - 3. Rear: 12.5 feet, however, the minimum distance from the property line to a garage door shall be 22 feet, or 24 feet to the alley travel way, whichever is more restrictive.
- d. Multiple Family:
 - 1. Front: 15 feet. The minimum distance from the front property line to a garage door shall be 25 feet.
 - 2. Side: 15 feet
 - 3. Rear: 20 feet
- e. Supplementary setback requirements:
 - 1. Roof eaves, bay window elements and similar features may encroach up to

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 1", Hanging: 0.5", Space After: 0 pt, Line spacing: single, No widow/orphan control, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

- 30 inches into any required setback.
2. Corner lots shall require compliance with the front setback standards on each side of the lot that fronts a public street.
3. There shall also be a 50 foot building setback from Sylvan Lake Road in Neighborhood A1 and A2.

Deleted: ¶

Page Break

5. Maximum Building Height:
35 feet.

6. Maximum Lot Coverage:
 - a. Residential Multi-Family
 1. Building 60%
 2. All impervious materials - 70%
 - b. Residential Single Family
 1. Building 40%
 2. All impervious materials - 60%

7. Maximum Density:
The maximum density shall not exceed 15 dwelling units per gross acre for development within any Multi-Family Tract as shown on the initial Final Plat for each Neighborhood.

8. Neighborhood A1 Core Trail:
The Multi-Family buildings in west/central area of Neighborhood A-1 shall be configured in such a manner to accommodate an alignment of the future 10 foot wide asphalt trail identified on the Neighborhood A-1, Phase 1 Trails Plan as described below.

This trail will serve as a main route for children to access the park site at a location close to the north side of the school's vehicular access system. This trail shall be configured to encourage use by children and designed in such a manner that provides direct views of the park site where possible and places a strong emphasis on safety at roadway crossings. This portion of the trail system will be approved by the Town as part of the Development Permit review process for the adjacent multi-family buildings and the trail shall be constructed concurrent with the multi-family units.

Deleted: school

Deleted: school

Deleted: school

Deleted: In the event construction is initiated on the school prior to completion of the trail, the developer shall cause completion of this trail prior to the opening of the school....

9. Supplemental requirements:
The minimum depth for first floor front porches shall be 7 feet.

B. Residential Two – Neighborhood D:

1. Purpose:
To provide sites for lower density single family homesites.
2. Uses by Right:
 - a. Single family dwelling units not to exceed 7,000 square foot maximum size.
 - b. Accessory apartment to single family dwelling as defined by the Town of Eagle Municipal Code, not to exceed 700 square feet.

Deleted: ¶

- c. Model homes.
 - d. Parks, open space and community gardens.
 - e. Home occupations.
 - f. Utility service structures and buildings/ maintenance facilities.
 - g. Pedestrian and bicycle trails.
 - h. Ponds, reservoirs and irrigation ditches.
 - i. Temporary construction staging areas.
 - j. Additional uses determined to be similar to uses by right listed above.
 - k. Accessory uses customarily appurtenant to uses by right listed above.
 - l. Accessory buildings may include detached garages, sheds and similar structures.
 - m. Temporary tree farm
 - n. Typical agricultural uses may continue within the neighborhood until residential site development is initiated.
 - o. Mail box drop boxes or similar mail delivery facilities.
 - p. Temporary sales office.
3. Special Uses:
- a. Day care of more than 8 children and elderly care.
 - b. Bed and breakfast.
 - c. Gravel borrow pit for on-site use.
 - d. Special Events
4. Minimum Building Setback Requirements:
- a. Front: 25 feet
 - b. Side: 15 feet
 - c. Rear: 20 feet.
5. Supplementary setback requirements:
- a. Corner lots shall require compliance with the front setback standards on each side of the lot that fronts a public street.
 - b. Roof eaves, bay window elements and similar features may encroach up to 30 inches into any required setback.
 - c. All garage doors shall be a minimum of 25 feet from the facing property line.
6. Maximum Building Height:
35 feet.
7. Maximum Lot Coverage:
- a. Building - 30%
 - b. All impervious materials - 50%
8. Building Envelopes:
The Subdivision Final Plat or Plats for Neighborhood D shall contain appropriate notations requiring building envelopes to be designated on certain lots prior to any site grading or other disturbance of the designated lot. Specifically, any lot over 1/2 acre shall be limited to a building envelope of 15,000 square feet. Application(s) for Subdivision

Final Plat shall include a supplemental exhibit specifying lots requiring building envelopes. Upon approval of such supplemental exhibit by the Town Planner, any modification of such supplemental exhibit shall require approval from the Town. The owner of such lot shall propose a building envelope as part of the application for design review and building permit. The proposed building envelope shall comply with all criteria affecting building envelopes contained in the Design Guidelines as approved by the Town, and shall be so indicated graphically on a landscape/ site plan. This landscape/site plan shall also include calculations to indicate the building envelope does not exceed 15,000 sq. ft. The Town reserves the right not to issue a building or site improvement permit until a building envelope, if required, that complies with all approved Design Guideline criteria has been approved by the Design Review Committee.

As used in this document, the term "building envelope" shall be deemed to include the residence, any allowable accessory buildings, driveways, walkways, patios, and landscaped areas.

All portions of a lot outside of the designated 15,000 square foot building envelope shall maintain the existing pasture grasses or be landscaped in a dryland, native or xeric style that requires minimal irrigation. Any landscaping of this area shall require approval by the DRB.

9. Wildlife Corridor and Berm:

At the time of the first subdivision plat for Neighborhood D a 500 foot wide wildlife corridor shall be established on the adjacent open space to the east of Neighborhood D, as indicated on the approved PUD Development Plan attached as Exhibit A. If at this time a corresponding 500 foot wide wildlife corridor has not been provided or committed on the adjacent Adam Rib Ranch property, then a 1000 foot wide corridor is required on the Haymeadow Planned Unit Development. At the time of this final plat a deed restriction shall be placed on this wildlife corridor to guarantee its protection. This corridor shall be maintained in agricultural production.

The construction of a landscape screening berm shall be included in the public improvements for Neighborhood D. The purpose of this landscape screening berm is to provide visual buffer between the animals using the wildlife corridor and the activity associated with Neighborhood D. The final plat or deed restriction will include language that ensures this landscape screen/ berm is a permanent landscape feature. A conceptual graphic that illustrates the intent of the landscape berm is attached as Exhibit C.

C. Recreation Open Space – Tract E, Town of Eagle Recreation Site:

1. Purpose:
To provide a land area for a recreation site to be dedicated to the Town of Eagle.
2. Uses by Right:
 - a. Indoor and outdoor recreation and entertainment facilities.
 - b. Parks and picnic facilities.
 - c. Community Center.
 - d. Cultural and educational buildings and activities.
 - e. Concessions, food and beverage service.
 - f. Special events including sports events and tournaments, entertainment and cultural events.
 - g. Public Administration building.
 - h. Administration/Maintenance facilities.
 - i. Equestrian, pedestrian and bicycle trails.
 - j. Dog park.
 - k. Community gardens.
 - l. Playgrounds, play equipment and water features.
 - m. Temporary structures, tents and trailers associated with special events.
 - n. Landscape improvements.
 - o. Lakes, ponds, reservoirs and irrigation ditches
 - ~~p.~~ Special events utilizing either indoor or outdoor facilities of the ~~park~~, including sporting, cultural or entertainment events.
 - ~~q.~~ Temporary construction/administration office.
 - ~~r.~~ Agricultural uses.
 - ~~s.~~ Public or private roads and utilities including bridges, utility, improvements, lines and mains, facilities, services and buildings.
 - ~~t.~~ Additional uses determined to be similar to uses by right listed above.
3. Minimum Building Setback Requirement:
There shall be a 25 foot building setback from all lot lines that front public roads, except from Sylvan lake Road where a 50 foot setback shall be required. From other lot lines there shall be no minimum except must be sufficient to accommodate utilities, drainage, access, fire and building code regulations.
4. Maximum Building Height:
35 Feet. Architectural features such as a tower, cupola or other architectural focal point may have a maximum height of 42 feet if approved by the Haymeadow Design Review Board.
5. Density Allowance:
N/A
6. Maximum Site Coverage:
N/A

Deleted: /School

Deleted: and School

Deleted: and a school site

Deleted: p.→ Public and/or Private School and related ancillary facilities, which may include, but not be limited to, classrooms, common areas, gymnasiums, cafeterias, theatres, offices, meeting rooms, parking, and outdoor recreation and athletic facilities. A bus barn or overnight vehicle storage area would not be considered a use-by-right.

Deleted: q

Deleted: school

Deleted: r

Deleted: s

Deleted: t

Deleted: u

D. Natural Open Space Tracts - OS-A, OS-B & OS-C, as labeled on the Preliminary Subdivision Plan, as well as future open space Tracts which will be created through resubdivision of Tract H of the PUD Preliminary Subdivision Plan. The approved PUD Development Plan depicts the general location and size of the future Open Space and Neighborhood areas within Tract H. The PUD Preliminary Subdivision Plan is attached as Exhibit B.

1. Purpose:
To provide sites for natural open space, active recreation, agricultural uses, trails and park facilities, water storage and drainage improvements and landscape improvements.
2. Uses by Right:
 - a. Equestrian, pedestrian and bicycle trails.
 - b. Landscape Improvements.
 - c. Lakes, ponds, reservoirs and irrigation ditches.
 - d. Shade shelters and picnic facilities.
 - e. Public or private roads, trailhead parking, restrooms, and utilities including bridges and utility improvements, tanks, lines, mains, pumphouses, facilities, services and buildings.
 - f. Agricultural uses and associated facilities.
 - g. Community gardens and associated facilities.
 - h. Dog parks.
 - i. Special events associated with agricultural facilities, community garden facilities, trails and trailheads, such as athletic, entertainment or cultural events.
3. Building Setback requirement
25 feet
4. Maximum Building Height
35 feet
5. Gross Density Allowance:
N/A
6. Maximum Site Coverage:
N/A
7. Supplemental Requirements:
The design and placement of recreation trails adjacent to the eastern wildlife corridor and open space shall minimize the impact of recreation users upon wildlife.

Deleted: j. Weddings and community events hosted at the existing cabin and the surrounding area, which shall include the right to improve said structure and seasonally install an outdoor tent from May through October.

E. Fire Station - Tract G:

1. Purpose:
To provide a site for a fire station and related improvements.
2. Uses by Right:
 - a. Fire station and related ancillary facilities, which may include, but not be limited to, offices, meeting rooms, training areas, crew quarters and temporary residences for fire fighters.
 - b. Additional uses determined to be similar to uses by right listed above.
 - c. Accessory uses customarily appurtenant to uses by right listed above.
3. Building Setback Requirement:
There shall be a 25' building setback from all lot lines.
4. Maximum Building Height:
35 feet. Architectural features such as a tower, cupola or other architectural focal point may have a maximum height of 42 feet if approved by the Haymeadow Design Review Board.
5. Haymeadow DRB approval and Town of Eagle Development Permit approval will be required prior to construction of buildings or alteration of the site.

F. Trailhead Park – Tract F

1. Purpose:
To provide a site for active park and recreation facilities, formal and informal play fields, open space, ponds and water features, stream corridors and recreation trails, community buildings and facilities.
2. Uses by Right:
 - a. Indoor and outdoor recreation and entertainment facilities.
 - b. Parks and picnic facilities.
 - c. Community Center.
 - d. Cultural and educational buildings and activities.
 - e. Concessions, food and beverage service.
 - f. Special events including sports events and tournaments, entertainment and cultural events.
 - g. Administration/Maintenance facilities.
 - h. Homeowner Association or Metro District operated or contracted enclosed storage or administration building.
 - i. Equestrian, pedestrian and bicycle trails.
 - j. Dog park.
 - k. Community gardens.
 - l. Playgrounds, play equipment and water features.
 - m. Temporary structures, tents and trailers associated with special events.

- n. Landscape improvements.
 - o. Lakes, ponds, reservoirs, raw water irrigation structures and facilities and irrigation ditches.
 - p. Temporary construction/administration/sales office. Public or private roads and utilities including bridges, utility, improvements, lines and mains, facilities, services and buildings.
 - q. Agricultural uses.
 - r. Additional uses determined by the Town Planner to be similar to uses by right listed above.
3. Building Setback Requirement:
There shall be a 25' building setback from all lot lines.
4. Maximum Building Height:
35 feet. Architectural features such as a tower, cupola or other architectural focal point may have a maximum height of 42 feet if approved by the Haymeadow Design Review Board.

G. Cabin – Tract I

1. Purpose:

To provide a venue for special events including but not limited to weddings, community and corporate events including overnight stays by guests for no more than two consecutive nights.

2. Uses by Right:

- a. Cabin with kitchen, bathrooms and dressing/bedroom rooms.
- b. Indoor and outdoor special events limited to a maximum of 170 attendees.
- c. Landscape Improvements
- d. Seasonal tents for special events
- e. Parking for no more than 20 vehicles
- f. Portable self contained restrooms.
- g. Equestrian, bicycle and pedestrian trails.

3. Building setback requirement: 25 feet from all lot lines

4. Maximum Building Height 24 feet

5. Gross Density Allowance: One Dwelling Unit not to exceed 2,500 square feet

6. Maximum site coverage: N/A

7. Supplementary Regulations:

- a. Special Events utilizing outdoor space shall not be allowed on a seasonal basis between the dates of December 1 to May 15.
- b. No amplified music shall be allowed between the hours of 11:00 pm and 9:00 am.
- c. Water and wastewater connection to the cabin shall be completed at the time those utilities are extended into Neighborhood D.
- d. Special Event parking for events larger than 20 attendees shall be accommodated on ABRIKA owned Haymeadow property or guests shall be shuttled in from private offsite locations. No off-site parking in public parking lots or on Town of Eagle property or road right of ways shall be permitted.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Times

Formatted: List Paragraph, Indent: Left: 0.75"

H. School – Tract J

Formatted: Font: Bold

8. Purpose:

To provide a land for a school site to be dedicated to the Eagle County School District.

9. Uses by Right:

h. Public and /or private school and related ancillary facilities, which may include but not limited to, classrooms, common areas, gymnasiums, cafeterias, theaters, offices, meeting rooms, parking and outdoor recreation, athletic and teaching facilities. A bus barn or dedicated overnight vehicle storage would not be considered a use-by-right..

i. Indoor and outdoor special events.

10. Building setback requirement: 25 feet from all lot lines

Maximum Building Height 35 feet.. Architectural features such as a tower, cupola or other architectural focal point may have a maximum height of 42 feet if approved by the Haymeadow Design Review Board.

11. Gross Density Allowance: N/A

12. Maximum site coverage: N/A

4. DENSITY CONTROL

Allowable maximum densities for each Neighborhood Parcel are set forth within the following density chart; provided however, that any Neighborhood Parcel may contain up to 1.25 times the total number of allowable dwelling units as described below. Any such increase in density of a Neighborhood Parcel shall be offset by an equal decrease in density from another Neighborhood Parcel. The intent of this provision is to allow flexibility in planning to take into account varying site conditions, market conditions and other design factors. There shall be no transfer of density allowed into Neighborhood D.

In no event shall the total number of residential units in all planning parcels within the Haymeadow PUD combined exceed 837 units. Accessory dwelling units not exceeding seven hundred (700) square feet appurtenant to single family dwellings shall not be included in such limitation.

The combination of two or more existing residential units into a lesser number of units shall first be approved by the Haymeadow Design Review Board and the Town Planner if any of such units have been designated as an affordable housing unit pursuant to the Town of Eagle Local Employee Residence Program. Approval by the Town shall be granted if such combination is in conformance with this PUD Guide and any applicable building codes.

However, residential units designated as affordable housing units shall not be combined if such combination would reduce the total number of affordable housing units below the minimum number of required affordable housing units required under the Town's Local Employee Residence Program.

The Haymeadow Homeowners (Design Review Board) and the Town of Eagle shall have all remedies available to them at law or in equity to enforce the provisions of this Section.

Accompanying each Final Plat and Development Permit application shall be an inventory of dwelling units that have been approved by previously final plats and/or Development Permits for each respective Neighborhood.

Neighborhood	Single Family/Duplex	Multi-Family	Total # D.U.
A1	82	258	340
A2	103	86	189
B	161	0	161
C	97	0	97
D	50	0	50
TOTAL	493	344	837

Deleted: 146

Deleted: 228

Deleted: 48

Deleted: 209

Deleted: 64

Deleted: 161

Density within each neighborhood has been defined in the PUD Development Plan and the PUD Guide as two unit types: Multi-Family and Single Family/Duplex. Up to 25% of the units identified as Multi-Family may be converted to Single Family/Duplex units and allowed in areas referenced as Multi-Family on the PUD Zoning Plan. No additional density beyond the 837 approved units is allowed.

5. PARKING REQUIREMENTS

All uses within Haymeadow will be subject to the parking standards of the Town of Eagle Land Use & Development Code with the following exceptions. Any on-street parking spaces shall be constructed as guest or park parking and may not be counted toward fulfilling residential parking requirements. Each single-family or duplex residence shall have a minimum of two on site parking spaces in addition to any garage space. These parking spaces shall fit within the property and not overhang any public walkway or travel way. Any accessory dwelling associated within a single family residence shall have one dedicated on-site parking space. A Bed and Breakfast use as defined in this PUD Guide shall provide the required single family parking plus one additional parking space per guest room.

6. DESIGN REVIEW

Design guidelines shall be prepared which will establish architectural and building material standards, landscape design, urban design, site design standards and a design review process for development within Haymeadow. These guidelines shall be approved and in place for any area of the Haymeadow PUD prior to the approval of any Subdivision Final Plat for that area. The Design Guidelines shall be submitted to the Town for review and approval by the Town Board using the Major Development Permit Review process. Subsequent major revisions to the

guidelines shall be subject to the same review and approval process of the Town of Eagle.

The Haymeadow Home Owners Association shall establish a Haymeadow Design Review Board that shall have authority and responsibility over the design review process. In the event that the Haymeadow Design Review Board ceases to fulfill its duties as described in the guidelines the Town of Eagle may assume the role of the Design Review Board.

All projects requiring a Town of Eagle permit shall adhere to the standards of this PUD and, where not specifically covered, the provisions of the Town of Eagle Land Use Code.

Applicants for all new development proposals, new buildings or building modifications, new landscaping or landscaping modifications, as defined in the adopted design guidelines, shall submit such proposals for review and approval by the Design Review Board.

The Town of Eagle shall not issue a building permit or grading permit without prior approval by the Design Review Board as demonstrated by drawings stamped as approved by the Design Review Board.

1. **Architectural Design Standards:**

The site design concept for Haymeadow, and for Neighborhood A in particular, is to create pedestrian friendly, walkable well-connected neighborhoods. A streetscape plan that includes a wide planting strip with street trees and sidewalks along both sides of the street will frame the residential development.

In the single family and duplex neighborhoods relatively narrow lots with uniform building setbacks, recessed garages and a well-established front porch element will create a strong neighborhood pattern. As the development progresses into Neighborhoods B, C and D the approved PUD Development Plan density decreases and the narrow lot pattern and streetscape design may become more relaxed.

Multi-family buildings will also be oriented to respect the streetscape while providing off-street parking. The buildings will be arranged to also focus on courtyard and open space access that will maintain a less formal but equally inviting pedestrian neighborhood quality.

The architecture of the Haymeadow community will both integrate with and enhance the beauty of the Town of Eagle and the Brush Creek valley. The intended goal is to develop a series of neighborhoods at ease with the surrounding ranching setting that look and feel like a natural evolution of the greater Eagle community. This will be assured through the development, adoption and enforcement of design guidelines that:

- a. Establish design and construction standards that both fit in the setting and ensure a consistent high level of quality across a wide array of housing types;
- b. Respond to the unique attributes and sensitivities of the site which are reflected in the design tenets underlying the plan;
- c. Implement a diverse but cohesive, unified and balanced architectural and landscape theme;

- d. Control massing of buildings to be appropriate in scale and context;
- e. Site structures in a manner which responds to existing physical site features, maximizes vistas, privacy and addresses energy usage ;
- f. Utilize forms and materials that honor the site's cultural history.

The Applicant has begun to develop housing designs that are illustrative of its vision for the property and are attached as Exhibit D.

These illustrative drawings:

- are examples of the type and style of housing that can be achieved in each residential building type. The architectural character will offer variety but will also include a style that ties together the single family and multi-family building types;
- reflect the general design principals outlined above which are the framework to be expanded upon and implemented in future design guidelines.

The architecture of the Haymeadow Community is inspired by the natural materials and simple gathered forms of the surrounding historic Colorado ranch compounds. These typical asymmetric historic buildings which evolved over time have a casual and intimate architecture which is at harmony with the land. The proposed palette of natural earth colored stucco, timbers and stained wood sidings will give the buildings a natural patina that will blend in with the surroundings. The architecture of the community will be rooted in the history of the place.

The main element of the house should typically be two stories in height and typically have gable roof(s) with smaller attached one-story elements with typical shed roofs. Buildings are generally taller in the middle and step down at ends with typically one and a half story massing at the sides of the house and should step with grade to minimize site grading.

Primary building materials/colors must be muted tones derived from the earth, trees and rock outcroppings of the surroundings environment.

2. Environmental Building Practices:

- a. Low environmental impact and energy efficiency approaches to site planning, design, landscaping and construction are highly encouraged.
- b. Owners are encouraged to review LEED guidelines published by the US Green Building Council (www.usgbc.org) which encourage energy efficiency, resource efficiency and healthy indoor air quality.
- c. Passive and active solar is highly encouraged. Hot water and photo voltaic solar panels are encouraged to be well planned and integrated in to the architectural design. Panels should be installed in the same plane as the roofs and close to flush with the roof. Solar panels and all associated mounting brackets and hardware shall be all black. No bright shiny metal elements are allowed.

3. **Landscape Design Standards:**

Landscape Design Standards will be written and adopted as an integral part of the overall design guidelines. The intent of the landscape design guidelines will be provide standards for landscaping and water conservation within the PUD that enhance and maintain the character of the residential neighborhoods and public spaces of the Haymeadow PUD. The Landscape Design Guidelines shall comply with the Town of Eagle Water Efficiency & Conservation plan as applicable. This will be accomplished by:

- a. Setting minimum and maximum standards for planting within residential and public spaces.
- b. Promoting the conservation of water through selection of proper plant palettes and the use of efficient irrigation techniques.
- c. Controlling the spread of noxious weeds and invasive plant species.

4. **Illumination Design Standards:**

Illumination design standards for residential and public uses shall be included within the approved design guidelines. The intent of these standards will be to provide compliance with adopted Town of Eagle lighting requirements and appropriate dark sky practices.

5. **Fencing Design Standards:**

Fencing design standards shall be included within the approved design guidelines. The intent of these standards will be to provide a compatible appearance among residential properties and to regulate the structure, location, height, color and materials of fencing prior to installation. Where appropriate and as required, wildlife friendly fencing will be specified.

6. **Specific Design Considerations:**

Specific design considerations have been discussed with the Town of Eagle through the Haymeadow PUD Development Plan approval process. This section of the PUD provides a commitment to incorporate certain design considerations into the Haymeadow Design Guidelines.

- a. Final Plat and Development Permit applications shall include site and landscape design considerations for each Sylvan Lake Road intersection that creates key visual corridors into the adjacent neighborhood, creating a sense of welcome and entry. This is of specific importance at the school road intersection.
- b. Any development plan that includes a enclosed storage building or a HOA/Metro District maintenance yard shall include appropriate landscape screening to screen the view from the public street. Any yard and building plan structures shall require approval of the Haymeadow Design Review Board.
- c. Cedar or other wood shake shingle products shall not be allowed as a roofing material.
- d. Multi-Family development and Fire Station shall be subject to Town of Eagle Development Permit review as outlined in Section 4.06 of the Town of Eagle Land Use and Development Code.

7. SIGNS

Sign regulations shall meet the Town of Eagle sign code; unless a comprehensive Haymeadow Sign Program is approved by the Town of Eagle.

8. DOGS AND PET CONTROL

Each dwelling unit will be permitted to house up to two dogs and offspring up to three months old. Residents will be prohibited from harboring dogs on their property unless they have adequate facilities (i.e., animals kept in residence, a fenced yard, an electronically fenced yard, dog run, or kennel) to contain the animals. Enclosed runs must be located immediately adjacent to the home, within the lot's building envelope if an envelope is required, and shall not exceed 1,000 square feet. If facilities are inadequate to contain the dog(s), the animals will be immediately removed from the subdivision until adequate structures can be built.

At no time are dogs to be allowed to run freely, other than within designated leash free dog parks. Haymeadow shall be subject to any and all leash laws and other pet regulations as adopted by the Town of Eagle.

Stray dogs may also be controlled by the Town and/or County and Colorado Department of Parks and Wildlife (CDPW). Homeowners not in compliance with these dog restrictions will be responsible for any and all costs incurred by the Town, County, and/or CDPW for enforcing these provisions.

Contractors, subcontractors and other construction related visitors shall be prohibited from bringing dogs onto the Haymeadow PUD.

9. FENCING

Any fencing separating a residential lot from adjacent natural open space shall be required to meet the wildlife friendly fencing guidelines of Colorado Parks and Wildlife.

The Haymeadow Metro District and/or Homeowners Association shall be responsible for maintaining a fence at appropriate perimeter sections of the PUD to keep cattle grazing on adjacent lands from entering the Haymeadow PUD.

10. TOWN OF EAGLE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

All multi-family buildings, the fire station, school and Trailhead Park pavilion building shall be required to obtain a Development Permit pursuant to Section 4.06 of the Town of Eagle Land Use and Development Code

11 TRASH RECEPTACLES

Single family residences within the Haymeadow PUD shall be restricted from storing or leaving

trash receptacles outside overnight. Trash receptacles shall be placed outside on the day of pick-up and shall be returned to an indoor location the same day.

Multi-family buildings shall provide wildlife resistant trash enclosure structures consistent with the approved Design Guidelines.

12. CONFLICTS

The specific provisions of this Guide shall supersede those of the Town of Eagle Land Use Regulations. However, where the Guide does not address an issue, the specific provisions of the Town of Eagle Land Use Regulations shall prevail. In cases of dispute or ambiguity, the Board of Trustees shall act to interpret.

13. AMENDMENTS TO THE HAYMEADOW PUD GUIDE, PUD DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND SUBDIVISION PLANS

It is anticipated that modifications or amendments to this PUD Guide, the PUD Development Plan, and Subdivision Plans will be necessary from time to time as Haymeadow progresses. This PUD Guide provides for two types of modifications or amendments: minor and major.

A. Minor Modifications:

Minor modifications are those changes which will not alter the original project concept but which may result in minor changes in the design of Haymeadow. Minor modifications include, but are not limited to internal road alignment alterations, minor adjustments to parcel boundaries, building envelope changes, and additions of land uses not previously listed but determined to be similar to listed uses. Minor adjustments to Planning Parcel boundaries shall be defined as:

Change in land use of a parcel of property not to exceed 20,000 square feet to conform to the land use of property immediately adjacent to it, provided however, that the provisions of this article shall not apply to property adjacent to any parcel of property the land use of which has previously been changed pursuant to the provisions of this article. Minor modification shall also include any decrease in size of a Neighborhood Residential parcel that is offset by an equal increase in an open space parcel.

Minor modifications may be authorized by the Town of Eagle Zoning Administrator upon written request. The Zoning Administrator shall act upon any minor modification request within 30 days of such a request. Any decision by the Zoning Administrator may be appealed in writing to the Eagle Board of Trustees within 30 days of such decision.

B. Major Modifications:

Major modifications are those changes not considered to be minor modifications and are changes that could alter the character or land use of a portion of the project.

Major modifications shall include:

1. Any increase in the total number of residential units.
2. Any change in land use designation of any parcels within the PUD, except as provided above.
3. Any additional of land into the PUD.

Major modifications shall be under the authority of the Eagle Board of Trustees. Applications for major modifications shall be heard in public hearing by the Board after receiving a recommendation from the Planning and Zoning commission. The Town Board shall approve the modification if it is found that the modification is consistent with the efficient development of the entire PUD and does not substantially affect the enjoyment of land abutting the PUD or the public interest.

Approved by Abrika Properties, LLC, the developer of the Haymeadow PUD, this _____ day of _____, 2014.

By: _____

TOWN of EAGLE Signature block:

Approved by the TOWN OF EAGLE, COLORADO, a municipal corporation acting by and through its Board of Trustees, this _____ day of _____, 2014.

_____, Mayor

ATTEST:

Town Clerk

Traffic Memorandum

To: Brandon Cohen
Abrika Properties, LLC
8250 SW 27th Avenue
Ocala, FL 34476

From: Kari J. McDowell Schroeder, PE, PTOE

Date: October 16, 2020

Re: **Haymeadow School Site Swap – Traffic Memo**
Eagle, Colorado

Abrika Properties, the developer of Haymeadow, is proposing to swap two land uses internal to the Haymeadow site. The development's current school site is located adjacent to the Town of Eagle's Pool and Ice Rink facility, on the northwest corner of the Haymeadow site. The applicant is proposing to swap the location of the school site with 112 multifamily units located on the northeast of Brush Creek Road and Ouzel Lane. The Town Park use will remain adjacent to the Pool and Ice Rink facility. **Figure 1** shows the site location of the proposed land use swap.




Figure 1: Proposed Land Use Swap

Project Background

The Town of Eagle previously approved a Transportation Impact Study¹ (TIS) for the Haymeadow development. Data and recommendations from this TIS are referenced in this analysis of traffic impacts from the proposed school site swap.

Trip Generation Impacts

The anticipated trip generation for each site was taken from the TIS¹. Refer to **Table 1**.

Table 1: Original Trip Generation Analysis from TIS¹

FH0905

Hay Meadow Project

8/13/2013

Haymeadow Traffic Study

Table 2. Trip Generation Estimate for the Haymeadow Development and the Recreation Facility

Parcel	ITE Code	Land Use	Size	Unit	Trip Reduction Factors			Average Daily Trips		External A.M. Peak Hour Trips			External P.M. Peak Hour Trips					
					Multi-Modal	Internal Trips and Multi-Purpose Trips	Pass-By	Rate	Total Trips with No Trip Reductions	Total External Trips With Trip Reductions	Rate	Total	In	Out	Rate	Total	In	Out
School	520/522	K - B School (4)	400	Students	0.10	0.375	0.00	1.36	916	459	0.47	159	87	72	0.15	51	25	28
A1	210	Single Family Detached	67	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	9.57	641	579	0.75	25	11	34	1.01	61	30	23
A1	230	Townhome / Condo / Apt	140	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	820	740	0.44	58	9	47	0.52	80	44	22
A1	(2)	Accessory Dwelling Units	10	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	59	63	0.44	4	1	3	0.52	5	3	2
Subtotal Parcel A1									1,520	1,372	105	21	84	132	85	47		
A2	210	Single Family Detached	90	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	9.57	861	777	0.75	31	15	48	1.01	92	52	30
A2	230	Townhome / Condo / Apt	93	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	545	462	0.44	37	5	31	0.52	44	29	15
A2	(2)	Accessory Dwelling Units	13	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	76	69	0.44	5	1	4	0.52	6	4	2
Subtotal Parcel A2									1,482	1,308	103	22	81	132	85	47		
B	210	Single Family Detached	147	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	9.57	1,402	1,220	0.75	100	25	75	1.01	134	94	50
B	230	Townhome / Condo / Apt	48	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	281	254	0.44	19	3	18	0.52	23	15	8
B	(2)	Accessory Dwelling Units	22	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	129	116	0.44	9	1	9	0.52	10	7	3
Subtotal Parcel B									1,817	1,640	129	29	89	167	106	63		
C	210	Single Family Detached	88	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	9.57	842	760	0.75	68	15	45	1.01	90	50	30
C	230	Townhome / Condo / Apt	64	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	375	339	0.44	25	4	21	0.52	30	20	10
C	(2)	Accessory Dwelling Units	13	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	76	69	0.44	5	1	4	0.52	6	4	2
Subtotal Parcel C									1,295	1,167	90	20	70	116	74	42		
D	210	Single Family Detached	50	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	9.57	478	432	0.75	34	9	25	1.01	45	25	17
D	230	Townhome / Condo / Apt	0	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	0	0	0.44	0	0	0	0.52	0	0	0
D	(2)	Accessory Dwelling Units	8	Dwelling Units	0.05	0.05	0.00	5.85	47	42	0.44	3	0	3	0.52	4	3	1
Subtotal Parcel D									526	474	37	9	28	50	32	18		
Civic	412	Community Park (3)	13	Acres	0.15	0.50	0.00	2.29	30	13	0.01	0	0	0	0.05	0	0	0
Civic	(1)	Fire Station	2	Acres	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	20	20	2.00	4	3	1	2.00	4	1	3
Total External Haymeadow Trip Ends:									7,504	6,483	626	191	435	682	408	244		
T.O.E. Rec.	495	Recreation Community Center	68	1,000 sq. ft.	0.10	0.10	0.00	14.00	952	771	1.02	89	54	35	1.45	90	30	50
T.O.E. Rec.	498	Soccer Complex	3	Fields	0.10	0.10	0.00	71.33	214	173	1.40	8	2	1	20.67	60	35	15
Total External Recreation Facility Trip Ends:									1,166	944	92	65	36	130	65	65		
Total External Trips From Both Sites:									8,670	7,427	718	247	471	782	473	309		

Total Single Family DUs: 442
 Total Multi-Family DUs: 345
 Total Accessory DUs: 68
 Total DUs: 853

Notes:

1. No ITE information available. Trip rate for Fire Station estimated for normal daily activity (not a fire event) assuming some resident fire fighters on-site.
2. To be conservative, Accessory Dwelling Units are assumed to be similar to apartment units from a trip generation perspective.
3. Community Park will not likely host a significant event during weekday peak hours.
4. ITE school rates have been prorated as follows: 78% Elementary and 22% Middle School / Junior High School.

Table 1: Trip generation Haymeadow June 2013

¹ Haymeadow Transportation Impact Study. Fox Tuttle Transportation Group, LLC. August 15, 2013.



A comparison of the sites to be swapped results in a net increase of daily trips for Neighborhood A. However, peak morning hourly trips are anticipated to be higher at the new school site. A comparison of the trip generation is included in **Table 2**. These trip generation calculations are based upon ITE's national trip generation methods². Reductions were already taken in the TIS for the school site's multimodal (pedestrian and bicycle), internal Haymeadow trips, and multi-purpose trips.

Table 2: Summary of Original and Proposed Trips

Time	Weekday Trips (vpd)	Peak AM Trips Inbound (vph)	Peak AM Trips Outbound (vph)	Peak PM Trips Inbound (vph)	Peak PM Trips Outbound (vph)
Neighborhood A					
Original – School Site	-459	-87	-72	-25	-26
Proposed – 112 Multifamily	+592	+7	+37	+35	+18
Difference	+133	-80	-35	+10	-8
Neighborhood B & C					
Original – 112 Multifamily	-592	-7	-37	-35	-18
Proposed – School Site	+459	+87	+72	+25	+26
Difference	-133	+80	+35	-10	+8

vpd = vehicles per day; vph = vehicles per hour

The proposed land use swap results in the following changed in traffic patterns.

- Neighborhood A
 - Net increase in daily trips of 133vpd. This is increase is caused because residential units are more likely to travel throughout the day than school traffic. This daily traffic increase will not be as noticeable as hourly traffic increases.
 - Decrease of 115vph in morning traffic. This is because residential traffic is less intensive in the morning than school traffic.
 - Comparable (+2vph) evening peak hour traffic.
- Neighborhood B & C
 - Net decrease in daily trips of 133vpd.
 - Increase in morning traffic due to the school drop-off peak traffic. This is typically an intensive travel time for 20 – 30 minutes before school starts.
 - Extra 80vph inbound to the school.
 - Extra 35 vph leaving after school drop off.
 - Comparable (-2vph) evening peak hour traffic.

² Trip Generation, 8th Edition, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 2008.



The increase in daily traffic at Neighborhood A will not be noticeable on the roadway network. The daily traffic increase is anticipated because residential units are more likely to travel throughout the day than school traffic. Neighborhood A is not anticipated to see a significant impact in hourly travel.

The largest impact of the proposed land use swap is the additional 115vph caused by the morning school drop-off traffic on Neighborhood B. This traffic increase is typically caused by an intensive travel time for 20 – 30 minutes before school starts. This impact is discussed in detail below.

Morning School Traffic Impacts on Neighborhood B

The original TIS made a general assumption in applying the directional distribution of the site-generated traffic to the entire Haymeadow site. Each land use will have its own unique pattern of where cars are coming from and going to. For example, the elementary school portion of the school site will likely draw largely from the future Haymeadow residents. Therefore, the original TIS anticipated that 280 morning and 91 evening peak hour trips would be a combination of pedestrian, bicycle, internal Haymeadow trips, and multi-purpose trips such as a parent dropping off a student on their way to work. Haymeadow has incorporated numerous sidewalk and trail improvements into the development, increasing the likelihood of students walking and biking to school.

Transportation Infrastructure Impacts and Conclusion

The additional 115 vph (80vph in / 35vph out) during the school's morning drop-off caused by the school site swap would likely all be external trips, accessed by Sylvan Lake Road or Ouzel Lane.

It is likely that approximately 2/3 of the additional traffic (53vph in / 23vph out) to new school location will access the school site via Sylvan Lake Road, as it provides the fastest travel time from Eagle Ranch and the surrounding neighborhoods. This will only increase traffic on Sylvan Lake Road from the original school site to the new school site, as the traffic was previously accounted for at the original school site. The Sylvan Lake Road extension into the Haymeadow property was adequately designed with two 11' wide travel lanes and a 5-foot-wide paved shoulder on each side to serve as on-street bike lanes. The Sylvan Lake Road corridor will also include a separated 10-foot-wide bicycle/pedestrian path. This path will connect to the existing trails and sidewalks to the new Haymeadow development.

The remaining 1/3 of the additional morning traffic (27vph in / 12vph out) caused by the school site swap will likely access the school via Ouzel Lane. This may add to the southbound left turn movement from Brush Creek Road to Ouzel Lane towards the Haymeadow project. The configuration of the Brush Creek Road and Ouzel Lane intersection should be studied prior to the time of Final Plat.

The future school site should be designed to accommodate the anticipated queues within the school property. The configuration of the school site circulation will directly impact operations and travel on the adjacent street network. The school's proposed circulation and operations should be reviewed by the Town's Traffic Engineer.



Please call if you would like any additional information or have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,
McDowell Engineering, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kari J. McDowell Schroeder".

Kari J. McDowell, PE, PTOE
Senior Traffic & Transportation Engineer

Orchard
Dev.



Brush Creek
Townhomes
Dev.

Tract E - Current
Mtn Rec/School
Location

Soleil Dev.

MF
A1

SF/
Duplex
A1




Cabin Site



Neighborhood D

Cabin Location





Date: February 26, 2021
Re: Public Comment Summary for PUDA20-01 Haymeadow PUD Amendment
From: Jessica Lake, Planner I, Community Development Department

To date, staff has received (81) public comment letters for both the school and the events cabin, including (1) fact sheet from the developer and (3) informal petitions; with generally (61) and the petitions being in opposition to the school swap, (3) of whom are also in opposition to the cabin; (9) are in support of the cabin, (7) are in support of both the school swap and the cabin, and (4) are in support of the school swap.

Some of the concerns identified by the public regarding the School Swap are as follows:

- o Homeowners in Soleil relied on the approved PUD plan for Haymeadow when making the decision to buy. Swapping the school parcel for housing will negatively affect property values. The land swap would financially benefit a private developer at the expense of Soleil homeowners.
- o The developer claims that the real estate market has changed since the PUD approval in 2014. Because of this, they want to build the high-density housing sooner and in a location closer to the start of the development. The real estate market changes constantly, and if the developer had not had so many delays, perhaps he could have taken advantage of the market as it was at the time of his original proposal. This is not a problem that should concern the Town of Eagle.
- o The proposed land swap financially benefits the developer due to deferring infrastructure costs. It negatively impacts Soleil homeowners due to reduced property values from adjacent high density housing and blocked mountain views. Soleil homeowners should not bear the burden of the developer's financial challenges.
- o The placement of the school was extensively thought through by Town of Eagle staff and the school board during the PUD process. There was an extensive traffic study regarding the school placement in an effort to avoid traffic issues currently experienced at Brush Creek Elementary. It was decided that they didn't want traffic driving through a neighborhood. Additionally, the original location allows the school and Mountain Recreation to share facilities and resources. The location of the school should not be changed because of the developer's financial issues.
- o This development has taken 17 years to get to this point, which shows very inadequate planning. The developer submitted and received approval for a specific land distribution, which Soleil homeowners relied upon. Now the developer wants to defer infrastructure costs, so is proposing the land swap, which again highlights his inadequate planning. The developer should not be bailed out at the expense of Soleil homeowner's property values.



- o The developer scheduled a meeting with Soleil homeowners for 6pm on Friday, October 23, 2020 to discuss the plans for the proposed land swap. At this meeting, homeowners were informed that they planned to submit their request for change to the PUD Monday morning, October 26, giving Soleil very little time to react.
- o The Traffic Memo dated October 16, 2020 concluded that an increase in traffic would occur if the swap is approved and that further studies are needed prior to Final Plat for the Ouzel and Brush Creek Road intersection. The memo focused on school traffic patterns from the approved location to the proposed, but does not take into account other factors. The memo referenced traffic and trip generation impacts that are based on the original studies done by Fox Tuttle in 2013, almost 8 years ago. One example of growth since the original traffic study is Frost Creek. In 2013, there were 32 members and today there are 350. The dwelling units have increased from 97 to an approved 137 units. That increase in growth and associated traffic outside of school related traffic has not been taken into account to properly justify a proposed swap of school to be located right off Brush Creek Road.
- o Another question comes into play as well with a proposed fire department and a school next to each other on the same street. What if while school is starting/ending with a line of cars in carpool waiting for their children to be dismissed, the fire department is dispatched with an emergency? How does that work or doesn't it? What are the safety measures that would be in place and implemented with these two buildings within such close proximity to each other? Does this create a delay in emergency response? More importantly, does this put students, staff and parents in harm's way when an emergency response is needed, creating a safety hazard and dangerous situation?
- o The concept of time and effort that went into choosing the school site should be a reason to keep the school site as currently approved. If not, it creates a conflict with the Elevate Eagle Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 4.1.010.C. in the current approved PUD, that various land use elements are designed so that they inter-relate cohesively with each other. The boundary between the PUD and adjacent land areas was taken into consideration to follow the requirements with particular attention to ensure that land use patterns were compatible with the school site and adjacent recreational and future master planned recreational facilities.
- o Haymeadow's original LERP approval states: "The LERP units shall be dispersed in a reasonable manner throughout each neighborhood. There may be more than one LERP unit per building, and there may be multi-family buildings that contain three or more LERP units. However, all, or a significant concentration of, the required LERP units for each neighborhood shall not be located within one multi-family project or cluster of buildings." This statement by Haymeadow directly contradicts their new submittal proposing an amendment to the school land use, by instead requesting to build all the multi-family units/LERP in one cluster of same-type units in Neighborhood A.



- o This proposed amendment states that an 18.3-acre portion of Neighborhood C would be re-classified as school use. However, the Haymeadow Land Use Summary (Current Unit Count) and (Proposed Unit Count) map pg. 8, details in C that acreage would fall from 47.1 to 32.1. If understanding correctly, that is only a differential of 15 acres. So, the proposed school land swap would actually only amount to less than an acre or .78 to the school?
- o Haymeadow notes 24% of multi-family units will be designated as deed restricted. This 24% seems like a misleading figure, as the 83 units (24% of 344 MF units) is actually the 10% requirement for the entire development of 837. Conversely, Hockett Gulch's website states 45% of their 396 rental units (178) will be deed restricted with no income restrictions.
- o Based on the Eagle Area Community, Plan (EACP), referenced numerous times in this developer proposed amendment, the demand for entry/ level and attainable units has been stressed since 2010 and prior. Therefore, the Haymeadow developer should have known and had all the available information at their disposal to make this decision in 2014.
- o The PUD density, locationally, would an extreme change from the approved plan, making the front portion of the development exceptionally overcrowded and crammed if the school land swap is approved. Keeping the school land as is, allows for ample and shared parking for events, creates less congestion with vehicles on street side parking around Mountain Rec area and Sylvan Lake Road parallel to Brush Creek Village, and keeps the original decisions to incorporate all activities with the school as approved. This may also become a source of income to the Town/ECSD for paid event parking, including for out-of-town guest parking in the school lot when utilizing our Eagle outdoor amenities/trails and attending organized events; around the Mountain Rec area. Based on the EACP, a discussion question was posed regarding how to reap more financial benefit from visitors to our community, this may create that option.
- o The developer points out in their proposed amendment application that the Haymeadow amendment does affect in a substantially adverse manner, the residents of Soleil. In what appears to be a diversion from compliance, Haymeadow attempts to mask the situation with landscape suggestions that are not acceptable. The homeowners of Soleil have overwhelmingly and collectively voiced their opposition to this proposed amendment to swap school land with a MF unit development; additionally, the noncompliance per section 4.11.050A,(2) still exists.
- o The current location for the school is ideal for minimizing traffic any further out of the Town.
- o As stated in the application: "in accordance with the Town of Eagle Code Section 4.11.050. an approved PUD zoning plan or an approved PUD development plan may be amended if the applicant demonstrates that the proposed modification (2) does not affect in a substantially adverse manner either the enjoyment of land abutting upon, adjoining or across a street from the Planned Unit Development or the public interest." Soleil homeowners will absolutely be substantially adversely



affected due to reduced property values resulting from moving the high density units closer to Soleil and due to obstruction of mountain views, which the developer admits.

- o The original site was chosen for the school to decrease traffic and to share facilities and fields with the Town of Eagle and Mountain Recreation. The school kids would be able to have walkable access to fields, bike trails, playgrounds, skating rinks, skate parks and more. By moving the school a mile away, this all but eliminates the possibility for Eagle's children to benefit from the Town's vision. Additionally, by having the school in its planned location, the Town of Eagle will be able to host even more bike and hockey tournaments, thus bringing in significant revenue.
- o While the EACP does call for concentration of density within designated growth boundaries, it also mentions not putting unlike or inappropriately matched development together, such that one will negatively impact the other. A low rent housing project would most certainly do this.
- o Many residents in Soleil bought their homes and paid a premium for their views, which would be negatively impacted by this proposed development.
- o The multi-family units proposed will not support the Town's concerns about creating more affordable housing. The noise generated by this many condos and apartments will be significantly different from that of a school. Traffic is also a concern in this neighborhood and throughout Eagle. Eby Creek, Capitol Street, Grand Avenue are already to the max during rush hour. The airport expanding has further increased traffic. Should the Haymeadow project go through as intended this will add hundreds of cars going through already congested areas. We have yet to hear of the Town adding another I-70 exit to support the Eagle Airport, Costco, Eagle Ranch and the new Haymeadow Project.
- o It is essential to keep the school easily accessible, and it makes sense to have it near the Rec Center. Children will thrive with these collaborative resources and parents will feel confidence that they are raising children in the right place. This is a foundation for a healthy community.
- o The high concentration of the multi-family housing and lack of planning for parking and traffic considerations will be a burden on current homeowners.
- o If the proposal is denied, the developer can still build the project according to the existing PUD and affordable housing options can still be provided.
- o The proposed land swap goes against much of what is outlined in the Elevate Eagle Master Plan.
- o The proposed land swap will negatively impact the entire town, but mostly the children. The opportunity to have shared facilities-shared land, shared fields, and to be within walking distance of a community center-is a phenomenal one. Making this swap and moving the school would defeat the opportunity in one fell swoop.
- o In the original Haymeadow PUD proposal, the developer noted that a key feature of Haymeadow is: "A significant dedication of land for park expansion and a K-8 public school site adjacent to the



existing pool and ice arena that will create a tremendous regional park and school site for the entire community.”

- o The Town must require that the infrastructure to the proposed school site in Area C is installed now and that the Brush Creek Road Extension is constructed now.
- o When will a traffic impact study be done on Haymeadow, Ouzel and Eagle Ranch Road? The traffic is a safety concern in this area and with the addition of the school, would become a greater concern.
- o Is there opportunity for a round about at Brush Creek Road and Ouzel? Timing of such a project prior to the construction of the school may be important.
- o Given the additional traffic impacts from Haymeadow, when will the Brush Creek Road Extension be constructed? This would lead to better traffic flow from Haymeadow to the main part of Town.

Concern from the public regarding the proposed events cabin was as follows:

- o The manager’s cabin would be located approximately 1½ miles into the Haymeadow property. This is being touted as a viable economic engine. State what studies were done to prove any economic viability. This cabin has no connection to the requested swap, however, seemingly appears to be a marketing incentive for a swap. Is Haymeadow planning to rejuvenate the cabin either way? There are currently no utilities or construction in the area of the manager’s cabin. When would this rejuvenation actually take place and with what future phase of construction? How will this affect surrounding neighbors-humans/animals with regards to traffic, noise and other activities causing disruptions? Also, would the cabin be the TOE responsibility to maintain and provide upkeep ongoing, and at what cost, in actuality then, is the financial responsibility on the Eagle taxpayers?
- o Renovating the cabin on open space for use as an event center would be in direct conflict with what the DOW has recommended in complying with avoidance of critical wildlife habitat. This cabin has been a key location for wintering elk populations and continues to be a calving site in the spring. There is also a large hunting presence in the fall which would present a danger to any event attendees. It does not seem to be a good idea to encourage people to loiter in large numbers in close proximity to our wildlife areas. Also, would like to suggest an amendment to not pave the walking path against the Norther border of the development, thus making the trail seasonal and not maintained by the Town in snowy months, this would encourage pedestrian traffic to migrate centrally rather than to the outer borders of the development against critical wildlife habitat.

Public support was shown for both the Events Cabin and the School Site, as noted below:

- o It’s an improvement over the original plan to have Soleil back to another residential neighborhood rather than a school. The developer has said they will implement buffers between the Soleil and Haymeadow neighborhoods should the swap be approved. The developer has said there is no way to force the school to add in any barriers between the two neighborhoods.



- o Traffic patterns would not change by moving the school site.
- o The developer has communicated that the first phase of multi-family homes will be approximately 900 sf units and will be affordable housing, not low end housing. His design team worked on The Base Camp project so they have good taste. The developer's team has communicated that they plan on selling these new homes for \$400/sf. This should not lower home values in Soleil, but could be an increase in value.
- o The developer will fulfill his promises because there is written documentation of them.
- o It would be worse for the homeowners of Soleil if the school put field or parking lot 15' from the back of the Soleil properties. The School district has done this in other neighborhoods here to create boundaries.
- o Our community needs housing units now and the proposed density/school swap serves that need without consuming more land, adding new density or unvetted traffic impacts to the Town of Eagle.
- o In the instance of the proposed swap, it was obvious that the Haymeadow team studied and considered the economic and workforce housing reports conducted locally in recent years. They have identified a need in our community and seek to address it in a manner that benefits multiple parties by reimagining their existing PUD to address current needs. For example, not only will the Eagle County School District receive five additional deed-restricted units specifically for ECSD employees. This comes in addition to expediting the delivery of the vast majority of the project's LERP units into Phase 1. Again, this makes housing more attainable and available to those who need it in the near term.
- o Community outreach efforts by the developer are also extensive with feedback evident in parts of the Haymeadow application such as the incorporation of a 300' buffer and landscaped berm offered in consideration of adjacent neighbors. Building orientation is also respectful of neighbors existing view corridors.
- o By allowing the density/swap you let Haymeadow build critical quality housing (that's already approved and going to be built someday) now. That means 112 additional "households" to shop in our stores, buy gas, etc. This will contribute to the "critical mass" we in the local business community have been looking forward to for years. It will provide more citizens of Eagle to help build a good year round local economy. It will also give full time residents looking for a place to live a home.
- o The units Haymeadow wants to add into its first phase are already approved to be built. That means we don't need to approve a new development somewhere else to get the same amount of housing right away. This should be very important to the Town.
- o Eagle needs quality places for employees to live that complement their lifestyle and allow them to stay here in Eagle.



- o The swap will shift the vast majority of Haymeadow's LERP units into Phase 1, further guaranteeing that units will be even more attainable for locals seeking to buy a home in Eagle in the next few years. Since the application does not seek to add density to the PUD, there shouldn't be any concern over additional traffic or previously unvetted impacts.
- o The reactivation of the former Ranch Manager's Cabin as a wedding and event's venue makes sense as a local economic engine. The valley currently lacks a venue without a corporate feel – one that draws visitors to the charm of the mountains.
- o Many local businesses are struggling to stay afloat with the effects the pandemic has had on their ability to do business in a profitable manner. The thought of a wedding and event venue that draws discretionary income from outside of the community further allows local businesses to capture money spent here by people who visit from elsewhere. This is also an important part to a healthy local business economy.
- o The wedding and events market has continued to grow exponentially. Even through economic down times, like the 2008 recession and our current pandemic, an unchanging fact is that people love to congregate and celebrate. A constant complaint from Eagle County customers is how competitive and difficult it is to book a venue in this market. Economically the Town would thrive with more tourism venues. The event industry truly has a significant impact on hospitality/lodging, local retail and restaurants.
- o Restoring the cabin area near the Haymaker Trail will help clean up that area and make the trail experience better while providing another local economic engine.
- o We need to provide additional event venues and support local event businesses, these businesses need the help to recover from the pandemic. There are a lack of venues that directly benefit Eagle and this events cabin would help provide that.

List of Public Comments:


1. School Swap Fact Sheet issued by Owner's Representative.
2. Letter from Sanders dated 09/08/2020.
3. Letter from DiToro dated 10/24/2020.
4. Letter from Gauron dated 10/24/2020.
5. Letter from Wilson dated 10/24/2020.
6. Letter from Baran dated 10/25/2020.
7. Letter from Bennet dated 10/25/2020.
8. Letter from Bradley dated 10/25/2020.
9. Letter from Brown dated 10/25/2020.
10. Letter from Clayman dated 10/25/2020.



11. Letter from Gauron dated 10/25/2020.
12. Letter from Gerdes dated 10/25/2020.
13. Letter from Gornikiewicz and Danforth dated 10/25/2020.
14. Letter from Kinser dated 10/25/2020.
15. Letter from Kleinman dated 10/25/2020.
16. Letter from Miller dated 10/25/2020.
17. Letter from Owens dated 10/25/2020.
18. Letter from Paller dated 10/25/2020.
19. Petition opposing Haymeadow School Land Swap dated 10/25/2020.
20. Letter from Ryan dated 10/25/2020.
21. Letter from Scanlon dated 10/25/2020.
22. Letter from Stevenson dated 10/25/2020.
23. Letter from Suhadolink dated 10/25/2020.
24. Letter from Van Hekken dated 10/25/2020.
25. Letter from Wendell dated 10/25/2020.
26. Letter from Kleinman dated 10/26/2020.
27. Letter from Sanders dated 10/26/2020.
28. Letter from Ryan dated 10/28/2020.
29. Letter from Gould dated 11/18/2020.
30. Letter from Caldwell dated 11/23/2020.
31. Letter from Pletcher dated 11/30/2020.
32. Letter from Harrison dated 12/02/2020.
33. Letter from Benson dated 12/03/2020.
34. Letter from Nelson dated 12/03/2020.
35. Letter from Starr dated 12/03/2020.
36. Letter from Stockert dated 12/03/2020.
37. Letter from Shipman dated 12/04/2020.
38. Letter from Messmer dated 12/09/2020.
39. Letter from Junker dated 12/09/2020.
40. Letter from Owens dated 12/10/2020.
41. Letter from Williams dated 12/14/2020.
42. Letter from Jarrot dated 12/15/2020.
43. Letter from Dees dated 12/20/2020.
44. Letter from Bloess dated 12/22/2020.
45. Letter from Weaver dated 12/28/2020.
46. Letter from Schwartz dated 01/10/2021.
47. Letter from Eagle County Housing Task Force dated 01/11/2021.
48. Letter from Vandeven dated 01/28/2021.
49. Letter from Wendell dated 02/09/2021.



50. Letter from Bishop dated 02/12/2021.
51. Letter from Gauron dated 02/12/2021.
52. Letter from Harst dated 02/12/2021.
53. Letter from Leibig dated 02/12/2021.
54. Letter from Van Hekken dated 02/12/2021.
55. Letter from Damico dated 02/13/2021.
56. Letter from Gerdes dated 02/13/2021.
57. Letter from Kleinman dated 02/13/2021.
58. Letter from Broderick dated 02/14/2021.
59. Letter from Musser dated 02/15/2021.
60. Letter from Shaw dated 02/15/2021.
61. Letter from McCluer dated 02/16/2021.
62. Letter from David Dieter dated 02/21/2021.
63. Letter from Debra Dieter dated 02/21/2021.
64. Letter from Bennett dated 02/22/2021.
65. Letter and attached Facebook Petition from Blum dated 02/22/2021.
66. Letter from Carden dated 02/22/2021.
67. Letter from Clayman dated 02/22/2021.
68. Letter from Gornikiewicz dated 02/22/2021.
69. Letter from Johnson dated 02/22/2021.
70. Letter from Keyes dated 02/22/2021.
71. Letter from Steffen dated 02/22/2021.
72. Letter from Baran dated 02/23/2021.
73. Letter from Kerekes dated 02/23/2021.
74. Letter from McLaughlin dated 02/23/2021.
75. Letter from Owens dated 02/23/2021.
76. Letter from Scanlon dated 02/23/2021.
77. Letter from Sokup dated 02/23/2021.
78. Letter from Tvarkunas dated 02/24/2021.
79. Letter from Kirchner dated 02/24/2021.
80. Letter from Bellows dated 02/24/2021.
81. Petition from Owens dated 02/25/2021.



Haymeadow PUD Amendment Application Intent & General Fact Sheet

The Haymeadow PUD Amendment application consists of two parts.

1. Related to the “swap” of multi-family density from the outlying neighborhoods B & C and incorporating it into the near term construction of neighborhood A1.
2. Related to the redesign and activation of the existing “ranch manager’s cabin” as a top tier wedding and events space capable of hosting small group gatherings up to weddings and events serving as many as 150-170 people.

Key PUD amendment information:

- The Haymeadow PUD Amendment application **does not** request additional density
- The proposed amendments **do not** increase traffic

1) SWAP: The primary goal is focused on meeting current and future needs of Eagle County School District, Mtn Rec, Town of Eagle and Haymeadow while providing critical entry level housing units sooner and nearer to Eagle’s town core as envisioned in the [Eagle Area Community Plan](#).

- The Swap proposes to move 112 multifamily units planned for construction in Neighborhoods B & C onto the 14 acre approved School Site in Neighborhood A1.
- Effectively this moves the delivery of those units from 10-15 years from now and builds them in Neighborhood A1 in the near term (0-5 years).
- The existing 14 acre school site will be “swapped” for an 18 acre site adjacent to a park and the fire station in Neighborhood C.
- Eagle County School District has indicated that the existing and proposed school sites are comparable and that the District prefers the proposed school site to the currently approved location
- ECSD will also receive 5 additional deed-restricted units specifically for ECSD employees upon approval of the Haymeadow PUD amendment application
- Meetings and feedback conducted with adjacent neighbors have resulted in the inclusion of a 300’ buffer area and robust berm and landscape plan to accompany application approval and mitigate impacts of the density swap
- Building orientation is also contemplated to best preserve view corridors

2) Cabin Activation: The goal of the cabin activation is to create a unique and desirable wedding and event space utilizing the existing Ranch Manager’s Cabin and surrounding

area. The “Cabin Area” will be thoughtfully designed to accommodate small group events all the way up to weddings with attendance of 150-170 people all while giving a nod to Haymeadow’s agricultural and ranch history

- Reactivation effectively renovates, beautifies and utilizes the existing Ranch Manager’s Cabin and the surrounding “Yard” as a community benefit and local economic engine
- Renovations and capital improvements will focus on retrofitting the existing cabin for a new use while maintaining its original charm
- Robust landscape and infrastructure improvements will be made to prepare the area for use
- Haymeadow is committed to incentivizing renters to select and work with local vendors
- We are committed to supporting Eagle businesses in the renovation and ongoing activation of the cabin (builders, architects, etc.)
- Haymaker Trail will undergo a slight realignment in the cabin area to accommodate this proposed use
- The cabin could host as many as 20 weddings per season and numerous other community and small group events and fundraisers

###

From: [Angie Kyle](#)
To: [Jenny Rakow](#); [Chad Phillips](#); [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: FW: Haymeadow land swap
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 8:17:49 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Here is a letter from a Soleil homeowner who asked me to send her letter in.

Best,

Angie Kyle

Administrative Tech II

TOWN OF EAGLE

200 Broadway, PO Box 609, Eagle Co 81631

Phone: 970-328-9655, Fax: 970-328-9656

CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:



Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

From: Rae Sanders <raepsanders@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 10, 2020 4:46 PM
To: Angie Kyle <angie.kyle@townofeagle.org>
Subject: Re: Haymeadow land swap

Thanks Angie,
I will take Chad's suggestion and wait.
Thanks so much for your help.
Rae

On Thu, Sep 10, 2020, 3:54 PM Angie Kyle <angie.kyle@townofeagle.org> wrote:

Hi Rae,
I spoke with Chad about this and he suggested holding off on submitting this to the Town Council until the file is on the agenda for public comment. This way, all the comments related to this will be viewed at the same time. Would you like to wait or do you want to submit this now?

Best,

Angie Kyle

Administrative Tech II

TOWN OF EAGLE

200 Broadway, PO Box 609, Eagle Co 81631

Phone: 970-328-9655, Fax: 970-328-9656

CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:



Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

From: Rae Sanders <raepsanders@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 2:44 PM

To: Angie Kyle <angie.kyle@townofeagle.org>

Subject: Re: Haymeadow land swap

That is true, I believe you commented on if I chose to send something to list my concerns. Sorry for the confusion.

Rae

On Tue, Sep 8, 2020, 2:43 PM Angie Kyle <angie.kyle@townofeagle.org> wrote:

Hi Rae,

Thank you for your letter. Just to clarify, I didn't solicit a letter of your concerns. I informed you that I would forward any of your comments to our Community Development Director and Town Council if you preferred.

Best,

Angie Kyle

Administrative Tech II

TOWN OF EAGLE

200 Broadway, PO Box 609, Eagle Co 81631

Phone: 970-328-9655, Fax: 970-328-9656

CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:



Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

From: Rae Sanders <raepsanders@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 2:24 PM

To: Angie Kyle <angie.kyle@townofeagle.org>

Subject: Haymeadow land swap

Hello Angie,

We spoke on the phone about three weeks ago in reference to the Haymeadow Land Swap and you asked me to send you a list of my concerns. Some members of the Soleil Circle community are adamant this swap will not take place, however I do not believe they represent the majority of the homeowners. They represent the majority of the homeowners who show up for the meetings. We have had two meetings that I am aware of and a lot more people showed up for the first one than the second meeting on September 2nd. The reason the turnout was smaller is because many neighbors just want to stay neutral and not create ill will with their neighbors.

There are 2 - 3 homeowners that are spearheading this crusade and they are on a mission to stop something they have never seen renderings of. One of these homeowners just wants it stopped because she is tired of living in a construction site. As the developer of Soleil told me that is what you get when you buy into new construction and she bought into a new construction site. I don't believe that is enough of a reason to not at least hear the pros and cons of both sides. How can any of us make an educated rational decision when none of us have seen any renderings??

I first communicated with Brandon Cohen the evening of Monday July 27, 2020. He emailed me because of a letter I sent to Scott Schlosser earlier in the day. At that time I was totally against his development because the rumor mill had said it was going to be a high density development right outside my back door. Since the 1st communication on July 27th I have become very receptive to what Brandon is proposing for three reasons. First he has been extremely transparent and available to me at all times in the last 6 weeks. Secondly, I want the barrier he has proposed behind my home, something the school board does not offer its neighbors as can be seen by the pictures I took of other Eagle schools. I could not bear to have a chain link fence with tents on the other side 15' from my home. The school that is over on Eagle ranch Road actually has a broken fence with a piece of black tarp flapping in the air. How could that possibly be better for those of us who back up to the field? As for the other neighbors in Soleil my property is their barrier between the development of either a school or homes. I too would like a barrier and Brandon is offering one to be built before construction of the homes begin. Third, it has been my dream my whole life to move out to this valley and my husband and I finally decided to do it last year. My husband's granddaughter will be graduating college and wants to move out here, however even with the \$100,000 deposit her family would give her for a new home she would not have entry into this valley if she wanted new construction.

The neighbors are also concerned that the traffic patterns will change in Soleil. Mathematically if 800 homes have been approved for development the same amount of cars will pass down Brush Creek road to go to a home that is 350 feet away or a half of a mile away. None of us including me understand why the town plans on getting rid of the original Brush Creek road because it could be useful to direct the Sylvan Lake traffic that way as well as

construction vehicles. This would also be most helpful to the Soleil residents who back up to the new road who were told the barrier between their home and the road would be much wider and larger. So why let go of a perfectly fine existing road? Brandon tells me this has nothing to do with his project that this is a town decision. I would like to discuss this with the town.

From my correspondence with Brandon it is my understanding the first phase of multi family homes will be approximately 900 square feet of affordable housing, not low end housing. His design team worked on The Base Camp project so they have good taste! His team plans on selling these new homes for \$400.00 a square foot. Once again how does that hurt the surrounding home owners, we did not pay that for our homes. This could be a huge value increase in our existing homes, once again a good thing not a bad thing.

I tried to explain all of this to the homeowners at the 1st Soleil meeting however while the rest of us were sitting on the ground a member of our HOA who stood the whole time told me Brandon was "playing me" and I was foolish to believe him. After that no one really cared to hear what I had to say. I knew the answer to a lot of their questions but I was discounted after that meeting. The first thing we all learn in business is not to write down anything that is not true because it will come back to bite you. Brandon has written everything he has promised in emails that I could forward to the whole world if he did not do what he said. He also has to present to the town all of this before any decisions can be made. So if Brandon promises me a barrier I can assure you it will be on his proposal to the town because he does not want me sitting in a town council meeting waving any unfulfilled promises to the council.

The second Soleil circle meeting was on September 2nd and I went to that meeting knowing most in attendance would be against me and they were. The other interesting thing was how many less people attended the 2nd meeting. As explained to me by one of my neighbors she did not want to get in the middle of this fight and wanted to stay neutral. Those neighbors did not come. So let me share what the [people who came had to say. The most troubling thing I heard was from a couple I do not know, but the husband shared his concerns about having those kinds of people that do shift work and other undesirables who drive their work truck homes in his neighborhood. In this new world we are living in, it seems we should all be doing our best to be more inclusive and inviting to others and not judge a person as not being a good neighbor because they do shift work. I think we would all agree we are grateful for the nurses and doctors who do shift work. I also expressed to my neighbors that my husband's granddaughter wanted to move here but would not be able to afford any new construction in the valley even with her father's help. This is a young woman who would be an asset to our community. She is also who Brandon's project is looking for. There is a trend in the market on all levels for 20 to 30 year old people wanting smaller housing. They do not want to leave the same footprint that my generation has and they don't need the amount of stuff most of my generation needed. Again this is a bad thing and not a good thing?

Soleil circle has a realtor who owns a home that backs up to the field, however it is income property for her and she does not live in Soleil. So what happens in that field does not affect her daily life as it would mine. She stated at the last meeting (she did not attend the first one) she was against the land swap and that is her right to be. She also offered introductions to

town council members to discuss their unhappiness with the swap. I expressed to her and the employee of mountain rec (who owns a home in Soleil) that I was concerned about what would happen to my home's value and more importantly my peace and serenity if the town decided to build a field or parking lot 15' from my back fence. They both indicated they did not think that would ever happen. Again please see the attached photos showing what the town has done with other schools in our area where they create boundaries with their property. I have no reason to believe the school or town will not do the same behind my home. I have every reason to believe that Brandon Cohen offers me a different barrier that will also allow the elk and deer to continue to move through this field to find water. I also am not a realtor however I am heavily invested in real estate and yes a school is a plus for a community, however where I am from the homes that are in the direct path of the school or connected to the school sell for less a square foot and take much longer to sell than the houses 6 blocks away. I do not want my new home devalued, who would?

The other big issue for the neighbors against the swap is the wealth of Brandon Cohen's family. They see giving into this project as helping a wealthy family and why should they do such a thing? Let me answer that as someone who has spent a lifetime having businesses that had a wealthy clientele. Number one, many wealthy people spend their money building and improving things that employ contractors, sub contractors, consultants, landscapers etc... People are able to support their families and businesses because of wealthy families who build things. Once again why is having a wealthy family with deep pockets wanting to employ people and businesses in our community a bad thing? Also they perceive Brandon as being too young to take on such a bold project. I have two arguments for that idea. Number one as stated by the realtor who attended our second meeting Brandon is surrounding himself with good consultants. That is a sign that he knows what he does not know and is smart enough to surround himself with people who know the right answers. Secondly, in my opinion this young man has much more character than the trust fund kids I know back in New Orleans who do nothing but self indulge with their unearned wealth. Brandon Cohen could be doing the same, but he has chosen to have a for profit business that he believes will benefit the valley his family has been connected to since he was a child. Again can someone please tell me why this is a bad thing?

In closing Angie I would ask that you pass this along to Chad so that I too can have meetings with the decision makers of this project.

Thanks so much,

Rae Sanders

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Peyton Heitzman](#)
Subject: Fwd: Haymeadow School Swap
Date: Sunday, October 25, 2020 2:23:35 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2020 1:58:00 PM
To: Jessica DiToro <jesditors@gmail.com>
Cc: Jenny Rakow <jenny.rakow@townofeagle.org>; Brandy Reitter <brandy.reitter@townofeagle.org>
Subject: RE: Haymeadow School Swap

Hello Jessica,

□

Thank you for your email.

□

I am copying Jenny Rakow (the Town Clerk) and Brandy Reitter (the Town Manager) on this email to make sure your comments get entered into the public record.

□

Thank you,

□

□

Scott Turnipseed

Mayor

□

TOWN OF EAGLE

200 Broadway, PO Box 609, Eagle Co 81631

Phone: 970-328-6354, Fax: 970-328-5203

CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:



Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

□

□

From: Jessica DiToro <jesditors@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 24, 2020 5:00 PM
To: Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen

<andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenheimier <ellen.bodenheimier@townofeagle.org>; David Gaboury <david.g@townofeagle.org>

Subject: Haymeadow School Swap

█

Good afternoon,

█

I am a resident of the Soleil Homes neighborhood. I am opposed to the Haymeadow School Swap that has been proposed.

█

Thank you,

█

Jessica

From: [Colleen Gauron](#)
To: [Planning and zoning](#); [Scott Urnipseed](#)
Subject: Opposition to proposed Hay meadow Land swap
Date: Sunday, October 25, 2020 10:51:33 PM

Greetings

As a neighbor in the near vicinity of the Hay Meadow Dev, I am writing in opposition to the proposed Land Swap of proposed Elementary school site for a proposed 165 unit apartment complex. I'm intentionally keeping this email short as I've seen some well written communications that covered this thoroughly. I'm simply opposed to this request.

I would appreciate it if you would forward my comments to the PZ. Staff and council members etc.

Another comment . I would appreciate access to project plan or timeline for Hay Meadow dev. Last updates on haymeadow.com are from March 2020.

Kind Regards
Colleen Gauron
2023 Montgomerie Circle
Eagle
612 251 6268
Colleengauron@gmail.com

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Peyton Heitzman](#)
Subject: Fwd: Opposition to Haymeadow School Land Use Swap: 3 Soliel
Date: Sunday, October 25, 2020 2:23:4 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2020 1:57:09 PM
To: Stephan Wilson <swilson6714@gmail.com>
Cc: Jenny Rakow <jenny.rakow@townofeagle.org>; Brandy Reitter <brandy.reitter@townofeagle.org>
Subject: RE: Opposition to Haymeadow School Land Use Swap: 73 Soliel

□
Hello Stephan,

□
Thank you for your email.

□
I am copying Jenny Rakow (the Town Clerk) and Brandy Reitter (the Town Manager) on this email to make sure your comments get entered into the public record.

□
Thank you,

□
Scott Turnipseed

Mayor

□
TOWN OF EAGLE

200 Broadway, PO Box 609, Eagle Co 81631

Phone: 970-328-6354, Fax: 970-328-5203

CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:



□
Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

□

From: Stephan Wilson <swilson6714@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 24, 2020 5:49 PM
To: Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen

<andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; David Gaboury <david.g@townofeagle.org>

Subject: Opposition to Haymeadow School Land Use Swap: 73 Soliel

Good afternoon,

I opposed the Haymeadow land use swap both as a community member and professional engineer.

The swap, which would place any future school further up Brush Creek, does not appear to have the communities best interest in mind nore does it seem to provide any long term benefit to the Town of Eagle.

Design and development projects have long term effects and typically there is only one chance to do the project correctly as redevelopment is seldom an option.

Thank you,
Stephan

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Wyle](#)
Subject: F : Haymeadow Proposed changes
Date: Monday, October 2 , 2020 :01:34 M

On Oct 25, 2020, at 5:38 PM, Sue Baran <suebaran83@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello,

We attended the meeting regarding the land swap between the school district and the high density portion of the development of Haymeadow. Our neighbors have put forth the following points which we fully agree with. In addition, we purchased a home on Field Street, given that in all the plans that we were able to find, it was planned as a dead-end street.

I OPPOSE THE HAYMEADOW SCHOOL PARCEL LAND SWAP PROPOSAL for the reasons below:

- 1) Every Soleil homeowner relied on the city's PUD approval when purchasing at Soleil Homes and accepted that a school was slated to be built adjacent to Soleil. Swapping the school parcel for high density housing will negatively affect Soleil's property values. It is unacceptable to allow this land swap solely to financially benefit a private developer at the expense of Soleil homeowners.
- 2) The developer claims that the real estate market has changed since the PUD approval in 2014. Because of this, they want to build the high density housing sooner and in a location closer to the beginning of the development. The real estate market changes constantly, and if the developer had not had so many delays perhaps he could have taken advantage of the market as it was at the time of his original proposal. This is not a problem that should concern the Town of Eagle.
- 3) The proposed land swap financially benefits the developer due to deferring infrastructure costs. It negatively impacts Soleil homeowners due to reduced property values from adjacent high density housing and blocked mountain views. Soleil homeowners should not bear the burden of the developer's financial challenges.
- 4) The placement of the school was extensively thought through by Town of Eagle staff and the school board during the PUD process. There was an extensive traffic study regarding the school placement in an effort to avoid traffic issues currently experienced with Brush Creek Elementary. It was decided that they didn't want traffic driving through a neighborhood. Additionally, the original location allows the school and Mountain Recreation to share facilities and resources. The location of the school should not be changed because of the

developer's financial issues.

█

- 5) This development has taken 17 years to get to this point which shows very inadequate planning.█ The developer submitted and received approval for a specific land distribution, which our homeowner's relied upon.█ Now the developer wants to defer infrastructure costs, so is proposing the land swap, which again highlights his inadequate planning.█ The developer should not be bailed out at the expense of Soleil homeowners property values.

█

- 6) The developer scheduled a meeting with Soleil homeowners for 6pm on Friday October 23 to discuss the plans for the proposed land swap.█ At this meeting we were informed that they planned to submit their request for change to the PUD Monday morning, October 26, giving Soleil homeowners very little time to react.

Thank you for your consideration of this important community issue.

█

█

Susan and Jeff Baran
74 Field Street
Eagle, CO 81631

█

█

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [ngie yle](#)
Subject: F : Haymeadow Land Swap Opposition
Date: Monday, October 2 , 2020 :33:41 M

From: Linda Bennett <linda4bennett@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2020 11:15 AM
Subject: Haymeadow Land Swap Opposition

I OPPOSE THE HAYMEADOW SCHOOL PARCEL LAND SWAP PROPOSAL for the reasons below:

- 1) Every Soleil homeowner relied on the city's PUD approval when purchasing at Soleil Homes and accepted that a school was slated to be built adjacent to Soleil. Swapping the school parcel for high density housing will negatively affect Soleil's property values. It is unacceptable to allow this land swap solely to financially benefit a private developer at the expense of Soleil homeowners.
- 2) The developer claims that the real estate market has changed since the PUD approval in 2014. Because of this, they want to build the high density housing sooner and in a location closer to the beginning of the development. The real estate market changes constantly, and if the developer had not had so many delays perhaps he could have taken advantage of the market as it was at the time of his original proposal. This is not a problem that should concern the Town of Eagle.
- 3) The proposed land swap financially benefits the developer due to deferring infrastructure costs. It negatively impacts Soleil homeowners due to reduced property values from adjacent high density housing and blocked mountain views. Soleil homeowners should not bear the burden of the developer's financial challenges.
- 4) The placement of the school was extensively thought through by Town of Eagle staff and the school board during the PUD process. There was an extensive traffic study regarding the school placement in an effort to avoid traffic issues currently experienced with Brush Creek Elementary. It was decided that they didn't want traffic driving through a neighborhood. Additionally, the original location allows the school and Mountain Recreation to share facilities and resources. The location of the school should not be changed because of the developer's financial issues.
- 5) This development has taken 17 years to get to this point which shows very inadequate planning. The developer submitted and received approval for a specific land distribution, which our homeowner's relied upon. Now the developer wants to defer infrastructure

costs, so is proposing the land swap, which again highlights his inadequate planning. The developer should not be bailed out at the expense of Soleil homeowners property values.

6) The developer scheduled a meeting with Soleil homeowners for 6pm on Friday October 23 to discuss the plans for the proposed land swap. At this meeting we were informed that they planned to submit their request for change to the PUD Monday morning, October 26, giving Soleil homeowners very little time to react.

Thank you for your consideration of this important community issue.

Linda Bennett
116 Soleil Circle

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [ngie yle](#)
Subject: F : Haymeadow land swap submittal
Date: Monday, October 2 , 2020 :33:5 M

From: Kim Bradley <kbradley@slifer.net>

Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2020 11:35 AM

To: Chad Phillips <chad.phillips@townofeagle.org>; Charlie Perkins <charlieperkins@townofeagle.org>; Jesse Gregg <jgregg@townofeagle.org>; Kyle Hoiland <kyle.hoiland@townofeagle.org>; Bill Nutkins <bill.nutkins@townofeagle.org>; Matthew Hood <matthew.hood@townofeagle.org>; Robert Townsend <robert.townsend@townofeagle.org>; Lani Webb <lani.webb@townofeagle.org>; keegan.winkeller@townofeagle.org; Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; David Gaboury <david.g@townofeagle.org>

Cc: Kim Bradley <kbradley@slifer.net>

Subject: Haymeadow land swap submittal

To Town Council and P&Z Commission members. Thank for your time with all that you are doing for Eagle. The Soleil homeowners recently had a meeting with the Haymeadow development team and I would like to share some reasons as to why I oppose the school land swap proposal being submitted based upon the information provided to us:

- The placement of the school was extensively thought through by Town of Eagle staff and the school board during the PUD process. There was an extensive traffic study regarding the school placement in an effort to avoid traffic issues currently experienced with Brush Creek Elementary. It was decided that they didn't want traffic driving through a neighborhood. Additionally, the original location allows the school and Mountain Recreation to share facilities and resources. The location of the school should not be changed because of the developer's financial issues.

- This development has taken 17 years to get to this point which shows very inadequate planning. The developer submitted and received approval for a specific land distribution, which our homeowner's relied upon. Now the developer wants to defer infrastructure costs, so is proposing the land swap, which again highlights his inadequate planning. The developer should not be bailed out at the expense of Soleil homeowners property values.

- The developer scheduled a meeting with Soleil homeowners for 6pm on Friday October 23 to discuss the plans for the proposed land swap. At this meeting we were informed that they planned to submit their request for change to the PUD Monday morning, October 26, giving Soleil homeowners very little time to react.

Thank you again for your time and for educating yourselves on this upcoming submission.

Kim
122 Soleil Circle

Kim Bradley
Slifer Smith & Frampton Real Estate
Eagle, CO - Realtor/Branch Broker
K2@Slifer.net | 970.376.5814

Sent from my iPhone. Please excuse any typos

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [ngie_yle](#); [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: F : L S P OPPOS O
Date: Monday, October 2 , 2020 :01:2 M

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 25, 2020, at 10:44 PM, will brown <wbr5000@live.com> wrote:

OPPOSE THE HAYMEADOW SCHOOL PARCEL LAND SWAP PROPOSAL for the reasons below:

- 1) Every Soleil homeowner relied on the city's PUD approval when purchasing at Soleil Homes and accepted that a school was slated to be built adjacent to Soleil. Swapping the school parcel for high density housing will negatively affect Soleil's property values. It is unacceptable to allow this land swap solely to financially benefit a private developer at the expense of Soleil homeowners.
- 2) The developer claims that the real estate market has changed since the PUD approval in 2014. Because of this, they want to build the high density housing sooner and in a location closer to the beginning of the development. The real estate market changes constantly, and if the developer had not had so many delays perhaps he could have taken advantage of the market as it was at the time of his original proposal. This is not a problem that should concern the Town of Eagle.
- 3) The proposed land swap financially benefits the developer due to deferring infrastructure costs. It negatively impacts Soleil homeowners due to reduced property values from adjacent high density housing and blocked mountain views. Soleil homeowners should not bear the burden of the developer's financial challenges.
- 4) The placement of the school was extensively thought through by Town of Eagle staff and the school board during the PUD process. There was an extensive traffic study regarding the school placement in an effort to avoid traffic issues currently experienced with Brush Creek Elementary. It was decided that they didn't want traffic driving through a neighborhood. Additionally, the original location allows the school and Mountain Recreation to share facilities and resources. The location of the school should not be changed because of the developer's financial issues.

- 5) This development has taken 17 years to get to this point which shows very inadequate planning. The developer submitted and received approval for a specific land distribution, which our homeowner's relied upon. Now the developer wants to defer infrastructure costs, so is proposing the land swap, which again highlights his inadequate planning. The developer should not be bailed out at the expense of Soleil homeowners property values.
- 6) The developer scheduled a meeting with Soleil homeowners for 6pm on Friday October 23 to discuss the plans for the proposed land swap. At this meeting we were informed that they planned to submit their request for change to the PUD Monday morning, October 26, giving Soleil homeowners very little time to react.

Thank you for your consideration of this important community issue.

William Brown
94 Field Street

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Wyle](#)
Subject: F : Haymeadow land swap opposition
Date: Monday, October 2 , 2020 :33:25 M

From: Mike Claymon <mikeclaymon@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2020 11:10 AM

Subject: Haymeadow land swap opposition

I OPPOSE THE HAYMEADOW SCHOOL PARCEL LAND SWAP PROPOSAL for the reasons below:

1. Every Soleil homeowner relied on the city's PUD approval when purchasing at Soleil Homes and accepted that a school was slated to be built adjacent to Soleil. Swapping the school parcel for high density housing will negatively affect Soleil's property values. It is unacceptable to allow this land swap solely to financially benefit a private developer at the expense of Soleil homeowners.
2. The developer claims that the real estate market has changed since the PUD approval in 2014. Because of this, they want to build the high density housing sooner and in a location closer to the beginning of the development. The real estate market changes constantly, and if the developer had not had so many delays perhaps he could have taken advantage of the market as it was at the time of his original proposal. This is not a problem that should concern the Town of Eagle.
3. The proposed land swap financially benefits the developer due to deferring infrastructure costs. It negatively impacts Soleil homeowners due to reduced property values from adjacent high density housing and blocked mountain views. Soleil homeowners should not bear the burden of the developer's financial challenges.
4. The placement of the school was extensively thought through by Town of Eagle staff and the school board during the PUD process. There was an extensive traffic study regarding the school placement in an effort to avoid traffic issues currently experienced with Brush Creek Elementary. It was decided that they didn't want traffic driving through a neighborhood. Additionally, the original location allows the school and Mountain Recreation to share facilities and resources. The location of the school should not be changed because of the developer's financial issues.
5. This development has taken 17 years to get to this point which shows very inadequate planning. The developer submitted and received approval for a specific land distribution, which our homeowner's relied upon. Now the developer wants to defer infrastructure costs, so is proposing the land swap, which again highlights his inadequate planning. The developer should not be bailed out at the expense of Soleil homeowners property values.
6. The developer scheduled a meeting with Soleil homeowners for 6pm on Friday October 23 to discuss the plans for the proposed land swap. At this meeting we were informed that they planned to submit their request for change to the PUD Monday morning, October 26, giving

Soleil homeowners very little time to react.

Thank you for your consideration of this important community issue.

Mike Claymon
116 Soleil Circle
Eagle, CO
□

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Kyle](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to proposed Hay meadow Land swap
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 9:03:08 AM

On Oct 25, 2020, at 6:51 PM, Colleen Gauron <colleengauron@gmail.com> wrote:

Greetings

As a neighbor in the near vicinity of the Hay Meadow Dev, I am writing in opposition to the proposed Land Swap of proposed Elementary school site for a proposed 165 unit apartment complex. I'm intentionally keeping this email short as I've seen some well written communications that covered this thoroughly. I'm simply opposed to this request.

I would appreciate it if you would forward my comments to the PZ. Staff and council members etc.

Another comment . I would appreciate access to project plan or timeline for Hay Meadow dev. Last updates on haymeadow.com are from March 2020.

Kind Regards
Colleen Gauron
2023 Montgomerie Circle
Eagle
612 251 6268
Colleengauron@gmail.com

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Kyle](#)
Subject: FW: Haymeadow: tick to the Original Approved
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 9:02: 8 AM

On Oct 25, 2020, at 5:33 PM, Dave & Linda Gerdes <grdstr@gmail.com> wrote:

Greetings Council and members

We live at 2171 Montgomerie Circle in Brush Creek Village. We've been made aware that there may be an agenda item at this week's P&Z meeting regarding the Haymeadow requesting a land Swap. We would like to voice our strong OPPOSITION to this swap. Where did this idea come from... the neighbors weren't notified or involved!

When we purchased our townhouse in 2017, we did so with the understanding of the development plans in place for the Haymeadow field just across the street from our unit. There was no asterisk that the plan was likely to change. We are expecting the plans to proceed as originally approved.

Please feel free to email us or call to discuss further.

As a side note, we have regularly checked the Haymeadow website for status information but they don't seem to want to share anything. July 10 was their last post, and actually even those postings lacked meaningful information. Because of their lack of communication, I vote for them to grow hay again.. and certainly not to change the land use that was originally approved.

Yours truly,
Dave Gerdes
grdstr@gmail.com
(309) 452-9588

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Kyle](#)
Subject: FW: Haymeadow proposed Land swap
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 9:02: AM

On Oct 25, 2020, at 5:02 PM, Amy Gornikiewicz <amybiblioaddict@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Council Members et al.,

Please add us to the list of Soleil Homeowners that are vehemently opposed to the proposed land swap amendment by the Haymeadow developers.

In addition to the items listed below we would like to add that though the Eagle Community Plan does confirm the developer's claim that density should be as close to the town core as possible, it also says that uncomplimentary types of housing should not be inappropriately adjacent to one another. Furthermore, that no development should unnecessarily change the character of neighboring area's or obstruct natural view corridors.

Also, as long time Eagle homeowners we are appalled with the unbridled growth being allowed to ruin our home. Long story short, these are not going to be "affordable" for the targeted market, which will lead to more overpriced rental housing. So, can you honestly tell us that Eagle *immediately* needs several hundred more overpriced rental units (because the developer is over budget), in addition to the 500 plus at Hockett Gulch? Does anyone need to regularly make a turn on and off Grand Ave.? You can keep your studies; we already have a traffic problem! And with current world conditions driving a "workforce" migration, who exactly is going to buy all these units?

WE ALSO OPPOSE THE HAYMEADOW SCHOOL PARCEL LAND SWAP PROPOSAL for the reasons below:

- 1) Every Soleil homeowner relied on the city's PUD approval when purchasing at Soleil. Swapping the school parcel for high density housing will negatively affect Soleil's property values. It is unacceptable to allow this land swap solely to financially benefit a private developer at the expense of Soleil homeowners.
- 2) The developer claims that the real estate market has changed since the PUD approval in 2014. Because of this, they want to build the high density housing sooner and in a location closer to the beginning of the development. The real estate market changes constantly, and if the developer had not had so many delays perhaps he could have taken advantage of the market as it was at

the time of his original proposal. This is not a problem that should concern the Town of Eagle.

3) The proposed land swap financially benefits the developer due to deferring infrastructure costs. It negatively impacts Soleil homeowners due to reduced property values from adjacent high density housing and blocked mountain views. Soleil homeowners should not bear the burden of the developer's financial challenges.

4) The placement of the school was extensively thought through by Town of Eagle staff and the school board during the PUD process. There was an extensive traffic study regarding the school placement in an effort to avoid traffic issues currently experienced with Brush Creek Elementary. It was decided that they didn't want traffic driving through a neighborhood. Additionally, the original location allows the school and Mountain Recreation to share facilities and resources. The location of the school should not be changed because of the developer's financial issues.

5) This development has taken 17 years to get to this point which shows very inadequate planning. The developer submitted and received approval for a specific land distribution, which our homeowner's relied upon. Now the developer wants to defer infrastructure costs, so is proposing the land swap, which again highlights his inadequate planning. The developer should not be bailed out at the expense of Soleil homeowners property values.

6) The developer scheduled a meeting with Soleil homeowners for 6pm on Friday October 23 to discuss the plans for the proposed land swap. At this meeting we were informed that they planned to submit their request for change to the PUD Monday morning, October 26, giving Soleil homeowners very little time to react.

Thank you for your consideration of this important community issue.

Please feel free to contact us at:

amybiblioaddict@gmail.com or

PO Box 721

Eagle CO 81631

Amy Gornikiewicz

Peter Danforth

106 Soleil Circle

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Kyle](#)
Subject: FW: oppose t e Haymeadow c ool arcel Land wap roposal
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 :3 :30 AM

From: Amy Kinser <amy@everydayoutfitters.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2020 1:08 PM
To: Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; David Gaboury <david.g@townofeagle.org>
Subject: I oppose the Haymeadow School Parcel Land Swap Proposal.

October 25, 2020

Dear Town Council,

I am writing to you to express my opposition to the proposed land swap from the Haymeadow Development. I moved to Eagle in October 2018 into the Soleil neighborhood, and I did so with the understanding of what the surrounding area would look like in the near- and long-term future. That understanding included a school neighboring our development's property. In the past few months, I was incredibly disappointed to learn about the proposed land swap, for the following reasons:

- As stated above, I bought my house with the knowledge that there would be a school built behind me and my neighborhood. I was excited about that prospect, and even more so when we realized that the school would feed into the proposed community center.
- Myself and some of my neighbors paid a premium for a view of the New York Range, with the understanding that the school will be there. The proposed land swap and altered map with approximately 200 units all together on the western side of the property will obstruct that view. This will leave a very bad impression of the Town of Eagle that developers can just chop and change their developments once they've been approved. It sets a bad precedent.
- We understand that the Town spent a great deal of time and careful deliberation to determine the placement of the school, ultimately deciding on its original location due to the possibility of shared facilities and resources with the proposed Mountain Rec expansion. With so much deliberation and careful consideration on the location we do not understand why a developer would suddenly want the swap. The current location will be a benefit to the children who attend the school—and their families.
- This proposed land swap will negatively impact the entire town, but mostly the children. The opportunity to have shared facilities—shared land, shared fields, and to be within walking distance of a community center—is a phenomenal one. Making this swap and moving the school a mile and a half away would defeat the opportunity in one fell swoop.
- Having the school located in its original location means that car usage will decrease—more of the kids will walk or ride to school and then walk or ride to Mountain Rec's community center. Moving the school far away will—again—

increase traffic, increase noise pollution, and increase the carbon monoxide in the air. • I understand that traffic going through the neighborhood to get to the school will be a nightmare if the school is moved to the proposed new site. The traffic will get backed up down Brush Creek Road, especially with recreational access to Sylvan Lake State Park. • Mr. Cohen has stated that he wants to do the swap because it will save him money as well as earn him money with the sale of multiple units. I do not believe that a developer's budget mismanagement or profit is even remotely a decent reason to make this land swap. • Part of Mr. Cohen's budgetary issues comes from the fact he put the infrastructure in the wrong spot—it is not near where the high-density buildings are planned to go. This mismanagement is deeply concerning for the long-term viability of the project. Why didn't he put the infrastructure where it needed it be? The infrastructure work has been going for two years—if it takes them this long to do this horizontal construction, how long will it take to finish this development? • I have lost all confidence in their ability to schedule and manage this development properly given that they are constantly digging up places they've already dug up before to replace piping. Furthermore, they want to propose a swap without having any actual design or understanding of the costs involved. • During a conversation we had with Scott Schlosser, he told us that the development company are under no obligation to complete any phase after phase 1. It is my concern that they are trying to put all the multifamily development in phase 1 so that they can maximize their profit and walk away from subsequent phases. This will be a terrible eyesore and not what the Town of Eagle wants. • On Friday, 10/23, residents of the Soleil Neighborhood finally got a meeting with Mr. Cohen to see the renderings and ask him questions. We had been asking for this meeting for months, and then we found out that he's planning to submit his proposal on Monday, 10/26, barely giving us any time to reach out to you. The timing of the meeting and the subsequent submission is shady at best and tells us quite a bit about the morals and ethics of this developer. o In this meeting, Mr. Cohen showed us renderings. All the multi-family housing is in one spot, making it look a lot like the River Run and Kayak Crossing developments in Eagle-Vail. This does not follow any design or development currently in Eagle now and would not fit in with the surroundings—especially in Eagle Ranch. o The renderings also showed that each building has 24 two-bedroom apartments, but only 20 parking spots. If 48 people live there, where are all the cars going to go? o They claim that they conducted a traffic survey for the proposed swap, which they claim will only add eight additional cars an hour. If there are approximately 200 units with two bedrooms in each, that comes to 400 cars, total. I find it very hard to believe that 400 cars in one development will yield only eight cars an hour. o This multifamily housing does not have any kind of public transportation anywhere near it. If there are only eight cars an hour, just how are all the other people supposed to get to work? o Eagle County Schools is in the process of creating a workforce housing, so then who will this be for? Has the Town carried out a recent housing requirement study that substantiates all this additional housing being frontloaded onto this development? Given the current COVID-19 pandemic, our observations have led us to believe that families from the Front Range are moving out here—one- and two-bedroom units do not meet their requirements. Single family

homes do. o The pricing of these units is (we are led to believe) around \$400,000 for a one- or two-bedroom unit. A starting salary for an Eagle County School teacher is \$37,000. Just how is the workforce housing supposed to benefit a teacher with that ratio of income to house price?

- Moving the housing to the location where the school is supposed to be means that there will be a parking lot and then 35' high buildings. This will block the view of those who live in the duplexes and will be much more unsightly than a school which won't be built for 5-10 years.
- If all the units are so close together, the trash will become a massive problem. It will be an eyesore and it will attract wildlife. To be clear, I am not opposed to the Haymeadow development as it stands. We welcome new neighbors and the vitality it will bring to the Town. I am opposed to the land swap and all that it entails. There are so many reasons to keep the plan as it is, but as far as we can tell, the only reason to move forward with the land swap is to benefit the developer. That's not the way we do things in the Town of Eagle. For the reasons listed above, and others, we are adamantly opposed to the proposed land swap at the Haymeadow development. □□□□

Sincerely,
Amy Kinser

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Kyle](#)
Subject: FW: Haymeadow land swap
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 :3 :36 AM

From: Michael Kleinman <michaeljkleinmanlaw@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2020 9:43 AM
To: Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; David Gaboury <david.g@townofeagle.org>
Subject: Haymeadow land swap

Dear Mr. Mayor and counsel members,

I and my wife Doron Kleinman are full time residents of the City of Eagle living at the home known as 98 Soleil Circle Eagle Co 81631 which is part of the Soleil Homes Development. We purchased the home January 15, 2021 with the understanding that the adjoining land was designated as a future school site. As an adjoining landowner to the Haymeadow development, I along with a number of other residents, will be contacting you to express our opposition to the proposed land swap the developer has been working on for the past number of months. We have been advised that the developer will be filing for an amendment to the existing PUD the City approved some time ago.

Last Friday a number of the homeowners met with Brandon Cohen, who I understand is the principal running the development where we discussed his proposed amendment to the PUD. We understand the developer is proposing to swap land where the multi-family parcel situate far away from the recreation land would be exchanged for the present land designated for a future school. A copy of the proposed swap is attached.

The members of the community have discussed the swap a number of times and will be voicing their opposition or support once the filing occurs. We have assembled a list of reasons to oppose which I would be happy to share with you now or after the request to amend the PUD to permit the land swap is filed.

I intend to attend any public hearings and oppose the land swap portion of the requested amendment. I expect I will have the opportunity to cross examine the representatives of the developer at that time.

I understand some of the Soleil Homes residents have prepared a petition with a number of residents opposed to the swap and may be providing it today or tomorrow. My wife and I agree with that petition based on the developers proposed use of the land for high density condos.

I am not acting as the attorney for any party and our opposition is that of a landowner in the adjoining development. If you would like list of our reasons for opposing the land swap I am happy to provide them on request or meet with any of you as permitted by the rules of the City of Eagle and State of Colorado.

Michael J. Kleinman Esq.
C/O Law Offices of Michael L. Poindexter\
2132 Montane Dr. E.\
Golden, Colorado 80401
Telephone: 970-328-3986
Facsimile: (303) 526-1981

Alternate Email: Kleinmanlaw@q.com•Cellular Phone 303.359.1825

THE FOREGOING IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION, DIRECTED ONLY TO THE ADDRESSEE. IF YOU HAVE ERRONEOUSLY RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION, PLEASE DELETE THIS E-MAIL AND ALL ATTACHMENTS AND NOTIFY THE SENDER IMMEDIATELY. THE UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OR USE OF ANY INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN OR IN ANY ATTACHMENTS IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED BY SECTION 7-74-102 ET SEQ. OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES.

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Kyle](#)
Subject: FW: Land wap Haymeadow
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 9:02:38 AM

On Oct 25, 2020, at 8:49 PM, Martha Miller <millerreynolds4@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello-

I am writing to say that I'm opposed to the Haymeadow School parcel land swap and hope you will consider all the impacts that it will have on our community.

When the PUD was approved, the school location was thoroughly vetted by many parties. Two major considerations for the school site was the traffic impacts and shared use with the rec district. The town used the 'lessons learned' from Brush Creek Elementary to place the school where the traffic impacts would be minimized. Additionally, having the ability to share facilities and programs such as After School with the rec district makes good sense. The original PUD was well thought out.

I am a Soleil homeowner and am also concerned about the impacts to my property. I purchased my property assuming the land adjacent to my home would be a school site. Swapping public property to a private 'for profit' developer seems questionable.

My last point, the undeveloped school site is a great place for wildlife to winter. As our town becomes more and more developed, we've seen the impacts to the deer and elk population.

Thank you for reading my email and your consideration of this important community issue.

Best,
Martha Miller
172 Soleil Circle
Box 2107
Eagle CO 81631
970-343-2903

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Kyle](#)
Subject: FW: Haymeadow School Land Swap Proposal
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 3:06 AM

From: matt owens <mattowens007@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2020 12:42 PM
To: Chad Phillips <chad.phillips@townofeagle.org>; Charlie Perkins <charlieperkins@townofeagle.org>; Jesse Gregg <jgregg@townofeagle.org>; Kyle Hoiland <kyle.hoiland@townofeagle.org>; Bill Nutkins <bill.nutkins@townofeagle.org>; Matthew Hood <matthew.hood@townofeagle.org>; Robert Townsend <robert.townsend@townofeagle.org>; Lani Webb <lani.webb@townofeagle.org>; keegan.winkeller@townofeagle.org; Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; David Gaboury <david.g@townofeagle.org>
Subject: Haymeadow School Land Swap Proposal

All,

I am writing to you all to express my adamant opposition to the proposed Haymeadow land swap which I am led to believe will be issued on Monday October 26th 2020 by the developer Abrika Properties. The main reasons for my opposition are as follows:

We, like every other Soleil homeowner relied on the city's PUD approval when purchasing at Soleil Homes and accepted that a school was slated to be built adjacent to Soleil. Swapping the school parcel for high density multi family housing will negatively affect Soleil's property values. It is unacceptable to allow this land swap solely to financially benefit a private developer at the expense of current Soleil residents.

The developer claims that the real estate market has changed since the PUD approval in 2014. Because of this, they want to build the high density multi family housing sooner and in a location closer to the beginning of the development. The real estate market changes constantly, and if the developer had not had so many delays perhaps he could have taken advantage of the market as it was at the time of his original proposal. This is not a problem that should concern the Town of Eagle nor have we seen any information to substantiate their claim that \$400,000 one and two bedroom units are needed for this area. In my opinion and seeing the effects of the current Covid pandemic, we are actually seeing more families moving from the front range which actually indicates more single family housing is required which actually falls in line with the original Haymeadow plan.

The proposed land swap financially benefits the developer due to deferring some infrastructure costs. Due to their mismanagement and incompetence this revision to their plan would negatively impact the community. The revised plan indicates building 8 multi family buildings all within close proximity to each other, this type of design does not fall in line with any other design guidelines in

the surrounding areas. Unfortunately, this will end up looking like some other workforce housing projects closer to the ski resorts such as River Run and Kayak Crossing close to Dowd Junction. This is not what is required in Eagle nor does the area have the infrastructure and public transportation to support such as development.

The proposed redesign has not captured the parking needs that would be required on a project of this nature, in fact it indicates only 20 spaces and 16 garages per 24 units. If every unit has at least two cars this leads to substantial lack of dedicated parking which could result in parking being backed up on Brush Creek Road and surrounding roads which in turn would result in significant traffic issues and most likely accidents, not to mention the potential issues with children playing in the surrounding area.

I am led to believe that the placement of the school was extensively thought through by Town of Eagle staff and the school board during the PUD process. There was an extensive traffic study regarding the school placement in an effort to avoid traffic issues currently experienced with Brush Creek Elementary. It was decided that they didn't want traffic driving through a neighborhood which is what would happen with the revised plan. Additionally, the original location allows the school and Mountain Recreation which given the latest plans by Mountain Recreation presents an incredible opportunity to share facilities and resources which would benefit not only the children but also the whole town of Eagle. The children and the town should not miss out on this opportunity due to the financial issues and mismanagement of the project by the developer.

Haymeadow development has taken 17 years to get to this point which shows very inadequate planning and then the subsequent rush to start construction before their permit expired. In rushing this through before permit expiration we as residents of the surrounding work area have seen nearly two years of infrastructure work which has resulted in numerous mistakes on piping and drainage layouts resulting in constant digging work. Now that the developer is suffering financially as a result of this mismanagement they are proposing the land swap so they can hopefully make a quick profit on selling multi family housing (cheaper construction costs). In conversations with the developer's representative they have indicated they are under no obligation to complete any construction phases after this initial phase 1. With this in mind and them openly stating this, my only conclusion is that they are planning to halt construction after phase 1 thus leaving Eagle Ranch with a development that is not even half complete. The developer should not be bailed out at the expense of the residents of Eagle.

The developer scheduled a meeting with Soleil homeowners for 6pm on Friday October 23 to discuss the plans for the proposed land swap. At this meeting we were informed that they planned to submit their request for change to the PUD Monday morning, October 26, giving Soleil homeowners very little time to react. This only indicates the worst kind of ethics from the developer who really is looking out for themselves and not the residents of Eagle. It would be a shame for the Town of Eagle to approve this revision for a developer who does not have the Town's best interests in mind.

Finally and just to be clear, I am not opposed to the original Haymeadow development and would actually welcome it's completion. We welcome new neighbors and the vitality it will bring to the Town. I am opposed to the land swap and all that it entails. This land swap is to purely benefit the developer financially due to their own mismanagement and subsequent financial issues. The developer's representatives do not have any construction experience and this is their first project, as

a result they have unfortunately failed to produce what was originally planned. The surrounding neighbors and the Town of Eagle should not have to suffer as a result of this.

Apologizes, for interrupting your Sunday but with the late meeting on Friday this was the only real opportunity to reach out. I would like to thank you for your consideration of this important community issue and hope you will consider our opposition.

Many Thanks
Matt Owens

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Kyle](#)
Subject: FW: Haymeadow c ool te
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 9:02:2 AM

On Oct 25, 2020, at 3:59 PM, C. Paller <paller@centurylink.net> wrote:

I OPPOSE THE HAYMEADOW SCHOOL PARCEL LAND SWAP PROPOSAL for the reasons below:

█

1. Every Soleil homeowner relied on the city's PUD approval when purchasing at Soleil Homes and accepted that a school was slated to be built adjacent to Soleil. Swapping the school parcel for high density housing will negatively affect Soleil's property values. It is unacceptable to allow this land swap solely to financially benefit a private developer at the expense of Soleil homeowners.

█

2. The developer claims that the real estate market has changed since the PUD approval in 2014. Because of this, they want to build the high density housing sooner and in a location closer to the beginning of the development. The real estate market changes constantly, and if the developer had not had so many delays perhaps he could have taken advantage of the market as it was at the time of his original proposal. This is not a problem that should concern the Town of Eagle.

█

3. The proposed land swap financially benefits the developer due to deferring infrastructure costs. It negatively impacts Soleil homeowners due to reduced property values from adjacent high density housing and blocked mountain views. Soleil homeowners should not bear the burden of the developer's financial challenges.

█

4. The placement of the school was extensively thought through by Town of Eagle staff and the school board during the PUD process. There was an extensive traffic study regarding the school placement in an effort to avoid traffic issues currently experienced with Brush Creek Elementary. It was decided that they didn't want traffic driving through a neighborhood. Additionally, the original location allows the school and Mountain Recreation to share facilities and resources. The location of the school should not be changed because of the developer's financial issues.

█

5. This development has taken 17 years to get to this point which shows very inadequate planning. The developer submitted and received approval for a specific land distribution, which our homeowner's relied upon. Now the developer wants to defer infrastructure costs, so is proposing the land swap,

which again highlights his inadequate planning. The developer should not be bailed out at the expense of Soleil homeowners property values.

6. The developer scheduled a meeting with Soleil homeowners for 6pm on Friday October 23 to discuss the plans for the proposed land swap. At this meeting we were informed that they planned to submit their request for change to the PUD Monday morning, October 26, giving Soleil homeowners very little time to react.

Thank you for your consideration of this important community issue.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

10/25/20

Town of Eagle Members:

In anticipation of Brandon Cohen, Developer of Haymeadow, submitting a filing for a proposed land swap of the current school location within the PUD, please see attached an informal petition of surrounding residents who have signed their opposition to this land swap.

This is a partial list of signatures with many more to be submitted at public comment.

Thank you,
Residents of Soleil, Brush Creek Townhomes, and The Orchards neighborhood.

This document and corresponding petition signatures have been submitted to:

_____ employee name

_____ employee position

_____ date and time

Petition-from Soleil Neighborhood

Petition summary and background	A proposed land swap by developer in Haymeadow from original PUD filing
Action petitioned for	We, the undersigned homeowners of Soleil and surrounding neighborhoods, who would be most impacted by the proposed PUD land swap, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and NOT approve any proposed change or relocation of school land within Haymeadow.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Email	Date
Kimberly Bradley		122 Soleil Circle	kbradley@sl.fier.net	10-25-20
Scott Fritaler		122 Soleil Circle	Scott.ALC@Hotmail	10/25/20
Amy Kinser		134 Soleil Circle	akbusing@gmail.com	10/25/2020
Alfreds Santibana		1935 Montgomery Circle	Santibana 54@gmail.com	10/25/20
Alisa		1935 Montgomery Cir	alisa@condo-ms.org	10/25/20
Pawn Beacon		2047 Montgomerie		
Marylong		2153 Montgomerie		10-26-20
JACK BAKER		2221 Montgomerie Cir	jackbaker2500@gmail	10-26-20
Susan Baker		2221 Montgomerie Cir	Susanbaker2500@gmail	10-26-20
Susan Elliott		1502 Montgomerie Cir.	susan.elliott@eagleschools.net	10-26-20
Chris Elliott		1502 Montgomerie Cir	chris.elliott@eagleschools.net	10-26-20
MICHAEL JOHNSON		1102 N 1760 Knap		10/26/20

Answers to mail

Petition-from Soleil Neighborhood

Petition summary and background	A proposed land swap by developer in Haymeadow from original PUD filing
Action petitioned for	We, the undersigned homeowners of Soleil and surrounding neighborhoods, who would be most impacted by the proposed PUD land swap, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and NOT approve any proposed change or relocation of school land within Haymeadow.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Email	Date
BUD BARTNIK	Bud Bartnik	54 Field St	BBA779680@gmail.com	10/24/20
Kelly Reseigh	Kelly Reseigh	64 Field St	kellyreseigh@gmail.com	10/24/20
Will Brown	Will Brown	94 Field St.	mindee4@yahoo.com	10/24/20
Mindee Stevenson	Mindee Stevenson	94 Field St	Mindee4@yahoo.com	10/24/20
Bronson Fiole	Bronson Fiole	↓	BSF58@naui.edu	10/24/20
Martha Miller	Martha Miller	172 Soleil Circle	millerreynolds@gmail.com	10/24/20
Wendy Mullins	Wendy Mullins	2027 Montgomery	jim.mullins@gmail.com	10/24/20
Richard Le	Richard Le	2161 Montgomery		10/25/20
CATHERINE JARVIS	Catherine Jarvis	2241 Montgomery	b.jarvis@gmail.com	10-25-20
GARY SCANLON	Gary Scanlon	1720 Montgomery Cir	gscanb22@gmail.com	10/25/2020
Bart Harst	Bart Harst	1632 Montgomery CR	bharst@gmail.com	10/25/20
Linda Harst	Linda Harst	1632 Montgomery		10/25/20

Petition-from Soleil Neighborhood

Petition summary and background	A proposed land swap by developer in Haymeadow from original PUD filing
Action petitioned for	We, the undersigned homeowners of Soleil and surrounding neighborhoods, who would be most impacted by the proposed PUD land swap, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and NOT approve any proposed change or relocation of school land within Haymeadow.

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Email	Date
Tona Relefovs		1350 Wapiti Circle	Tona.just-fine@hotmail.com	10/24/20
Stephan Wilson		73 Soleil Cir Eagle Co	SWISNBTH@gmail.com	10/24/20
Jessica DiToro		73 Soleil Circle Eagle Co	jesditors@gmail.com	10/24/20
Michelle Miller		128 Soleil Circle Eagle Co	michelmiller298@gmail.com	10/24/20
MICHAEL KLENNAN		80 SOLEIL AVE EAGLE CO	KLES/NMANNLANWAY-Com	10/24/2020
DORON KLENNAN		80 SOLEIL AVE EAGLE CO	dorpn578200@gmail.com	10/24/2020
Beth Ryan		74 Soleil Circle	Bethryan04@gmail.com	10/24/2020
Tim Ryan		74 Soleil Circle	Tryell@gmail.com	10/24/2020
Ric Turner		56 Soleil Cir	RICHEATHREEMAIL.COM	10/24/20
Heather Turner		56 Soleil Circle	Same	10/24/20
Michelle Zarnuba		50 Soleil Cir	for ↑	10/24/20
Charles Zarnuba		50 Soleil Cir	czarnuba@hotmail.com	10-24-20

Petition-from Soleil Neighborhood

Petition summary and background	A proposed land swap by developer in Haymeadow from original PUD filing	
Action petitioned for	We, the undersigned homeowners of Soleil and surrounding neighborhoods, who would be most impacted by the proposed PUD land swap, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and NOT approve any proposed change or relocation of school land within Haymeadow.	

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Email	Date
JON WATERS		232 TANAGER CIRCLE, Eagle	jonw@waters.eagle@gmail.com	10/25/20
Mia Ericsson		232 Tanager Circle Eagle	mericsson.09@gmail.com	10-25-20
Loi Gay		238 Tanager Cir	loi.gay@centurytel.net	10/25/20
CHRISTEN DEWIL		242 Tanager Circle	christen420@gmail.com	10/25/20
Dale Green		0113 Ringneck	dahagreen@yahoo.com	10/25/20
Steve Greep		250 TANAGER CIRCLE	970.303.0347 stevegreep@gmail.com	10/25/20
Mary Liebl		250 Tanager Circle	lieblmery555@gmail.com	10/25/20
MICHAEL McDONALD		245 Tanager Circle	mcdonaldm@yahoo	10/25/20
DAVID McDONALD		245 Tanager Circle	eigentprises@yahoo.com	10/25/20
Jeff Frey		284 Tanager Circle	jpfrey@comcast.net	10/25
Shannon Sokup		273 Tanager Circle	sjsokup@gmail.com	10/25
David Blum		301 Tanager Cir	teletags@yahoo	10/25

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Email	Phone
Becky Hasselhoff		894 Tanager	rebecca.hasselhoff@gmail.com	10/25/20
Jake Hasselhoff		294 Tanager	jake.hasselhoff@gmail.com	10/25/20
Lauren Wilson		0304 Tanager	lauren.wilson.2009@gmail.com	10/25/20
GREGORY MEISTER		0304 Tanager	greg.meister.2014@gmail.com	10/25/20
Sons NALAK		287 Tanager	SAINT HOME@aol.com	10/25/20
Trina Whetung		75 Tanager	emmagwhetung246@yahoo.com	10-25-20
Jenna Bendley		78 Tanager	jenna.vrth.bendley@gmail.com	10/25/2020
Amy Yander		98 Tanager	Amy.Yander@yahoo.com	10/25/2020
Patrick Hasselhoff		103 Tanager	phasselhoff@gmail.com	10/25/2020
Christine Hasselhoff		103 Tanager Circle	cmstrom@gmail.com	10/25/20
Ralph Carlson		0128 Tanager Circle	rcarlson3481@gmail.com	10/25/20
Kathryn Regio		141 Tanager Cir	Kitty@Regio.com	10/25
Kristin Blanco		143 Tanager Cir	K_Hayden@hotmail.com	10/25
Enrique Carich		194 Tanager Cir	ValleyStoneBuilding.com	10/25
Annice Wambsler		222 Tanager Cir	annie.wambsler@gmail.com	10/25
Swath Townsend		669 Montgomerie	Townsend@att.net	10/25

Petition summary and background	A proposed land swap by developer in Haymeadow from original PUD filing
Action petitioned for	We, the undersigned homeowners of Soleil and surrounding neighborhoods, who would be most impacted by the proposed PUD land swap, are concerned citizens who urge our leaders to act now and NOT approve any proposed change or relocation of school land within Haymeadow.

Page 170 of 324

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Email	Date
Matt Owens		PO Box 180 4A Soleil Circle	mattozens@hotmail.co.uk	10/24/20
Elizabeth Owens		49 Soleil Circle	elizabeth.z.owens@gmail.com	10/24/20
Bruce Keyes		26 Saen Circle	brucekeyes@yahoo.com	10/24/20
Larae Keyes		26 Soleil Circle	laraekeyes@yahoo.com	10/24/20
Mike Stale		18 Soleil	mstalew.1000@gmail.com	10/24/2020
Sheryl Stale		18 Soleil	sstalew@mountainview.org	10/24/2020
Angie Kriedeman		0008 Soleil Cir.	akriedeman@arrowata@insuremail.net	10/24/20
Jimmy Suhadolnik		0008 Soleil Cir.	gilbertpackside@yahoo.com	10/24/20
Fred Reynolds		310 Mosher Ln.	frlrcnra@gmail.com	10/25/20
Laura Howe		166 Soleil Circle	Lalee1008@gmail.com	10/25/20
D. L. Anderson		84 Field St	Dawn Anderson ^{144 Hox} 144 Hox 10/25/20	10/25/2020
Dr. Andy		84 Field St	sarahambergco@gmail.com	10/25/2020

[illegible]

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Kyle](#)
Subject: : Oppose Haymeadow c ool Land wap
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 :30: 9 AM

From: Beth Ryan <bethryan04@gmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, October 24, 2020 5:26 PM

To: Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; David Gaboury <david.g@townofeagle.org>

Subject: Oppose Haymeadow School Land Swap

□

Hello,

I am a homeowner in the Soleil neighborhood, and I would like to formally express my opposition to the proposed land swap from the Haymeadow developer that is adjacent to Soleil Homes.

Thank you,
Beth Ryan

□

--

□

□

et Ryan
one: 9 2930
mail: bet_ryan0@gmail.com

--

□

□

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Kyle](#)
Subject: FW: Haymeadow
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 :29: AM
Attachments: [image00.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image00.png](#)

FYI:

Jenny Rakow, CMC

Town Clerk & Municipal Court Supervisor

TOWN OF EAGLE

200 Broadway, PO Box 609, Eagle Co 81631

Phone: 970-328-9623, Fax: 970-328-5203

CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:



Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

From: Gary Scanlon <gscan49@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2020 5:02 PM
To: Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>
Cc: Gary Scanlon <gscan49@hotmail.com>
Subject: Haymeadow PUD

Please forward this email to all members of Town Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission:

All,

Please be advised that we, along with many other residents of Eagle, are opposed to any changes to the current approvals for the Haymeadow development. In particular, we oppose any land swap with the developer for the park site or the school site, and hope you would not waste any time considering such a proposal.

Thank you for listening to the residents.

Sincerely,

Gary and Lou Scanlon

gscan49@hotmail.com

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Kyle](#)
Subject: FW: Opposition to the developer LA WA
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 9:0 : AM

On Oct 25, 2020, at 10:38 PM, Mindee Stevenson <mindee419@yahoo.com> wrote:

I OPPOSE THE HAYMEADOW SCHOOL PARCEL LAND SWAP PROPOSAL for the reasons below:

1

- 1) Every Soleil homeowner relied on the city's PUD approval when purchasing at Soleil Homes and accepted that a school was slated to be built adjacent to Soleil. Swapping the school parcel for high density housing will negatively affect Soleil's property values. It is unacceptable to allow this land swap solely to financially benefit a private developer at the expense of Soleil homeowners.

2

- 2) The developer claims that the real estate market has changed since the PUD approval in 2014. Because of this, they want to build the high density housing sooner and in a location closer to the beginning of the development. The real estate market changes constantly, and if the developer had not had so many delays perhaps he could have taken advantage of the market as it was at the time of his original proposal. This is not a problem that should concern the Town of Eagle.

3

- 3) The proposed land swap financially benefits the developer due to deferring infrastructure costs. It negatively impacts Soleil homeowners due to reduced property values from adjacent high density housing and blocked mountain views. Soleil homeowners should not bear the burden of the developer's financial challenges.

4

- 4) The placement of the school was extensively thought through by Town of Eagle staff and the school board during the PUD process. There was an extensive traffic study regarding the school placement in an effort to avoid traffic issues currently experienced with Brush Creek Elementary. It was decided that they didn't want traffic driving through a neighborhood. Additionally, the original location allows the school and Mountain Recreation to share facilities and resources. The location of the school should not be changed because of the developer's financial issues.

5

- 5) This development has taken 17 years to get to this point which shows very inadequate planning. The developer submitted and received approval for a specific land distribution, which our homeowner's relied upon. Now the developer wants to defer infrastructure costs, so is proposing the land swap,

which again highlights his inadequate planning. The developer should not be bailed out at the expense of Soleil homeowners property values.

- 6) The developer scheduled a meeting with Soleil homeowners for 6pm on Friday October 23 to discuss the plans for the proposed land swap. At this meeting we were informed that they planned to submit their request for change to the PUD Monday morning, October 26, giving Soleil homeowners very little time to react.

Thank you for your consideration of this important community issue.

Mindee Stevenson
94 Field Street
303-905-2345

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Kyle](#)
Subject: FW: oleil Land wapp
Date: Monday, October 26, 2020 :3 : AM

-----Original Message-----

From: Angie Kriedeman <gilbertparkside@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 24, 2020 6:24 PM
To: Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; ellen.bodenheimer@townofeagle.org; David Gaboury <david.g@townofeagle.org>
Subject: Soleil Land Swapp

Hello Town Council,

I would like you to know that I am opposed to the land swap for the Haymeadow Development, as a homeowner I do not want an apartment or condo building behind out development. I am hoping that council members take our opinion into consideration when voting on this. Again I am opposed to the land swap.

Thanks,

Jimmy Suhadolink

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Yle](#)
Subject: F : Opposed to Haymeadow proposed land swap
Date: Monday, October 2 , 2020 :30:50 M

From: Gina Van Hekken <ginavanhekken@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2020 2:19 PM

To: Chad Phillips <chad.phillips@townofeagle.org>; Charlie Perkins <charlieperkins@townofeagle.org>; Jesse Gregg <jgregg@townofeagle.org>; Kyle Hoiland <kyle.hoiland@townofeagle.org>; Bill Nutkins <bill.nutkins@townofeagle.org>; Matthew Hood <matthew.hood@townofeagle.org>; Robert Townsend <robert.townsend@townofeagle.org>; Lani Webb <lani.webb@townofeagle.org>; keegan.winkeller@townofeagle.org; Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; David Gaboury <david.g@townofeagle.org>

Cc: jcvanhekken@mitchandco.com

Subject: Opposed to Haymeadow proposed land swap

Dear Eagle Town Council and Eagle Planning and Development,

We are writing to you to express our ardent opposition to the proposed land swap from the Haymeadow Development. We moved to Eagle in August of 2008 and have always appreciated the feel of our small community in Eagle. We have lived in many housing situations since then and recently were able to purchase our first single family home in the Soleil Neighborhood in May 2019. It was a huge decision for us and we paid close attention to what the surrounding area would look like in the near- and long-term future. An understanding that there would be a school neighboring our development's property helped us make the decision to purchase our forever home. In the past few months, we along with all of our neighbors were incredibly disappointed to learn about the proposed land swap, for the following reasons:

- As stated above, we bought our house with the knowledge that there would be a school close by to our neighborhood. We were excited about that prospect, and even more so when we realized that the school would feed into the proposed community center.
- We understand that the Town spent a great deal of time and careful deliberation to determine the placement of the school, ultimately deciding on its original location due to the possibility of shared facilities and resources with the proposed Mountain Rec expansion. With so much deliberation and careful consideration on the location we do not understand why a developer would suddenly want the swap. The current location will be a benefit to the children who attend the school—and their families.
- This proposed land swap will negatively impact the entire town, but mostly the children. The opportunity to have shared facilities—shared land, shared fields, and to be within walking distance of a community center—is a phenomenal one. Making this

swap and moving the school a mile and a half away would defeat the opportunity in one fell swoop.

- Having the school located in its original location means that car usage will decrease—more of the kids will walk or ride to school and then walk or ride to Mountain Rec's community center. Moving the school far away will—again—increase traffic, increase noise pollution, and increase the carbon monoxide in the air.
- We understand that traffic going through the neighborhood to get to the school will be a nightmare if the school is moved to the proposed new site. The traffic will get backed up down Brush Creek Road, especially with recreational access to Sylvan Lake State Park.
- Mr. Cohen has stated that he wants to do the swap because it will save him money as well as earn him money with the sale of multiple units. We do not believe that a developer's budget mismanagement or profit is even remotely a decent reason to make this land swap.
- Part of Mr. Cohen's budgetary issues comes from the fact he put the infrastructure in the wrong spot—it is not near where the high-density buildings are planned to go. This mismanagement is deeply concerning for the long-term viability of the project. Why didn't he put the infrastructure where it needed it be? The infrastructure work has been going for two years—if it takes them this long to do this horizontal construction, how long will it take to finish this development?
- We have lost all confidence in their ability to schedule and manage this development properly given that they are constantly digging up places they've already dug up before to replace piping. Furthermore, they want to propose a swap without having any actual design or understanding of the costs involved.
- During a conversation we had with Scott Schlosser, he told us that the development company are under no obligation to complete any phase after phase 1. It is our concern that they are trying to put all the multifamily development in phase 1 so that they can maximize their profit and walk away from subsequent phases. This will be a terrible eyesore and not what the Town of Eagle wants.
- On Friday, 10/23, residents of the Soleil Neighborhood finally got a meeting with Mr. Cohen to see the renderings and ask him questions. We had been asking for this meeting for months, and then we found out that he's planning to submit his proposal on Monday, 10/26, barely giving us any time to reach out to you. The timing of the meeting and the subsequent submission is shady at best and tells us quite a bit about the morals and ethics of this developer.
- Moving the housing to the location where the school is supposed to be means that there will be a parking lot and then 35' high buildings. This will block the view of those who live in the duplexes and will be much more unsightly than a school which won't be built for 5-10 years.

To be clear, we are not opposed to the Haymeadow development as it stands. We welcome new neighbors and the vitality it will bring to the Town. We are opposed to the land swap and all that it entails. There are so many reasons to keep the plan as it is, but as far as we can tell, the only reason to move forward with the land swap is to benefit the developer. That's not the way we do things in the Town of Eagle. For the reasons listed above, and others, we are adamantly opposed to the proposed land swap at the Haymeadow development. Please consider the concerns of your Eagle Residents.

Gina and JC Van Hekken
59 Soleil Circle

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Angie Vile](#)
Subject: F : Opposition to a proposed land swap in Haymeadow
Date: Monday, October 2 , 2020 :01:52 M

On Oct 25, 2020, at 10:36 PM, "barb@reburblc.com" <barb@reburblc.com> wrote:

To Town of Eagle and School Board members:

□

I am writing to you in opposition to developer Brandon Cohen's upcoming proposed change to the Haymeadow PUD.

□

As a recent home buyer in Soleil, one of the reasons for purchasing included being told school property lie just across the fence in the adjoining development. Inherently, neighborhood schools typically help maintain or increase property values. More importantly, the school land location lends itself to a synergy within the fields and recreational facilities that would provide easy access for children/students to go to and from without creating a supervisory burden that would exist if the school location was moved further away. With the school land in its current location, it would allow more kids to walk or ride their bikes to school once built. The traffic patterns surely were studied prior to the development of Haymeadow and for this reason, the school should stay in its present location, as an approximately 200-unit complex would seemingly create double that in vehicle traffic flow in small concentrated area.

As a Soleil homeowner, we were told Field Street would never become a through street to Haymeadow, except to the school once built. Is this true?

The rendering recently provided by Mr. Cohen of 8 24-unit 3 story buildings within 100 yards of Soleil created more questions than answers. Mr. Cohen's rendering allowed for only 16 garages/cover parking spots per building. The rest would be on street parking? That number of parking structures seems very low for a multi-unit structure. Mr. Cohen also mentioned that he has right of first refusal to buy the school land and build if the school district should decide to sell the land. Does the school have any intention to ever sell that land? These questions and concerns make it an easy 'no' to the land swap, not to mention the height of the buildings would obstruct the beautiful mountain views.

These proposed changes seem to only benefit the developer financially at the expense of the current homeowners. The developer should have thought about this when getting the initial approval from the Town.

□

□

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Barb Wendell

Soleil resident since May 2020



<Haymeadow_Site_Plan.pdf>

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [ngie_yle](#)
Subject: F : Haymeadow land swap
Date: Monday, October 2 , 2020 10:54:1 M

From: Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2020 10:53 AM
To: Michael Kleinman <michaeljkleinmanlaw@gmail.com>
Cc: Jenny Rakow <jenny.rakow@townofeagle.org>; Brandy Reitter <brandy.reitter@townofeagle.org>
Subject: Re: Haymeadow land swap

Jenny and Brandy,
Please make sure this gets entered into the Public Record.
Thanks so much!
Scott T

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2020, at 10:24 AM, Michael Kleinman <michaeljkleinmanlaw@gmail.com> wrote:

If you need a list of reasons for our opposition it is attached. I would like these issues to be discussed at the public hearing once it is scheduled.

Michael J. Kleinman Esq.
C/O Law Offices of Michael L. Poindexter\
2132 Montane Dr. E\
Golden, Colorado 80401
Telephone: 970-328-3986
Facsimile: (303) 526-1981
Alternate Email: Kleinmanlaw@q.com•Cellular Phone 303.359.1825

THE FOREGOING IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION,
DIRECTED ONLY TO THE ADDRESSEE. IF YOU HAVE ERRONEOUSLY
RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION, PLEASE DELETE THIS E-MAIL
AND ALL ATTACHMENTS AND NOTIFY THE SENDER IMMEDIATELY.
THE UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OR USE OF ANY INFORMATION
CONTAINED HEREIN OR IN ANY ATTACHMENTS IS STRICTLY
PROHIBITED BY SECTION 7-74-102 ET SEQ. OF THE COLORADO
REVISED STATUTES.

On Sun, Oct 25, 2020 at 7:29 PM Michael Kleinman

<michaeljkleinmanlaw@gmail.com> wrote:

Thank you for the clarification.

I look forward to meeting all of you

Regards

On Sun, Oct 25, 2020 at 6:52 PM Matt Solomon, Trustee

<matt.solomon@townofeagle.org> wrote:

Michael-

As far as I know, there will be a hearing and questions will be asked. I believe what Mr. Palmer was saying was that we cannot comment or make any decisions until all the information is presented to us, as it is a quasi-judicial matter. That said, I (we) do appreciate your input and participation in the process. I did copy Adam so that I do not speak out of turn or on his behalf in a wrong manner.

I appreciate you reaching out and being involved.

Thank you, again.

Matt

Matt Solomon, Council Member

Town of Eagle

[200 Broadway](#), PO Box 609, Eagle, CO 81631

Phone: 970.328.6354

Facsimile: 970.328.5203

On Oct 25, 2020, at 19:37, Michael Kleinman <michaeljkleinmanlaw@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Consell members

Thank you for your timely response. I apologize for the typo regarding my date of purchase of [98 Soleil Circle](#). It was Jan 15, 2019.

Being unfamiliar with your counsel rules, am I to understand that when a Developer moves to amend its PUD and propose a major change in parcel use that a public hearing is held but adjoining landowners cannot ask their representatives why they propose such a change?

If so, how can you know the true reason for the proposed change? If the reason is different from their application I would think it proper to inquire into the motivation.

If you prefer me to provide a list of reasons that we oppose the PUD change, I am happy to do so. If you would provide a point person to contact rather than email

the entire counsel and Eagle representatives, please let me know
Regards

Michael J. Kleinman Esq.
C/O Law Offices of Michael L. Poindexter\
[2132 Montane Dr. E.](#)
[Golden, Colorado 80401](#)
Telephone: 970-328-3986
Facsimile: (303) 526-1981

Alternate Email: Kleinmanlaw@q.com•Cellular Phone 303.359.1825

THE FOREGOING IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
INFORMATION, DIRECTED ONLY TO THE ADDRESSEE. IF YOU
HAVE ERRONEOUSLY RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION,
PLEASE DELETE THIS E-MAIL AND ALL ATTACHMENTS AND
NOTIFY THE SENDER IMMEDIATELY. THE UNAUTHORIZED
DISCLOSURE OR USE OF ANY INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN OR IN ANY ATTACHMENTS IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED BY
SECTION 7-74-102 ET SEQ. OF THE COLORADO REVISED
STATUTES.

On Sun, Oct 25, 2020 at 5:27 PM Michael Kleinman
<michaeljkleinmanlaw@gmail.com> wrote:

I apologize for the typo
We purchased our home Jan 2019

On Sun, Oct 25, 2020 at 3:55 PM Adam Palmer
<adam.palmer@townofeagle.org> wrote:

Michael,

Thank you for your comments and email. I can't speak to your request to
cross examine the development application representatives, as that
typically isn't part of a quasi-judicial public land use hearing process, it is
my hope that such concerns and alternatives can be adequately voiced
and deliberated accordingly.

Thank you again,

Adam

Adam Palmer

Council Member

TOWN OF EAGLE

[200 Broadway](#), PO Box 609, Eagle Co 81631

Phone: 970-328-6354, Fax: 970-328-5203

CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:

[\[eagleoutside.com\]](#)

Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

-

From: Michael Kleinman <michaeljkleinmanlaw@gmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, October 25, 2020 9:43 AM

To: Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; David Gaboury <david.g@townofeagle.org>

Subject: Haymeadow land swap

-

Dear Mr. Mayor and counsel members,

-

I and my wife Doron Kleinman are full time residents of the City of Eagle living at the home known as [98 Soleil Circle Eagle Co 81631](#) which is part of the Soleil Homes Development. We purchased the home January 15, 2021 with the understanding that the adjoining land was designated as a future school site. As an adjoining landowner to the Haymeadow development, I along with a number of other residents, will be contacting you to express our opposition to the proposed land swap the developer has been working on for the past number of months. We have been advised that the developer will be filing for an amendment to the existing PUD the City approved some time ago.

-

Last Friday a number of the homeowners met with Brandon Cohen, who I understand is the principal running the development where we discussed his proposed amendment to the PUD.

We understand the devloper is proposing to sway land where the multi-family parcel situate far away from the recreation land would be exchanged for the present land designated for a future school. A copy of the proposed swap is attached.

-

The members of the community have discussed the swap a number of times and will be voicing their opposition or support once the filing occurs. We have assembled a list of reasons to oppose which I would be happy to share with you now or after the request to amend the PUD to permit the land swap is filed.

I intend to attend any public hearings and oppose the land swap portion of the requested amendment. I expect I will have the opportunity to cross examine the representatives of the developer at that time.

I understand some of the Soleil Homes residents have prepared a petition with a number of residents opposed to the swap and may be providing it today or tomorrow. My wife and I agree with that petition based on the developers proposed use of the land for high density condos.

-
I am not acting as the attorney for any party and our opposition is that of a landowner in the adjoining development. If you would like list of our reasons for opposing the land swap I am happy to provide them on request or meet with any of you as permitted by the rules of the City of Eagle and State of Colorado.

-
Michael J. Kleinman Esq.

C/O Law Offices of Michael L. Poindexter\

2132 Montane Dr. E.\

Golden, Colorado 80401

Telephone: 970-328-3986

Facsimile: (303) 526-1981

Alternate Email: Kleinmanlaw@q.com•Cellular Phone 303.359.1825

THE FOREGOING IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION, DIRECTED ONLY TO THE ADDRESSEE. IF YOU HAVE ERRONEOUSLY RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION, PLEASE DELETE THIS E-MAIL AND ALL ATTACHMENTS AND NOTIFY THE SENDER IMMEDIATELY. THE UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OR USE OF ANY INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN OR IN ANY ATTACHMENTS IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED BY SECTION 7-74-102 ET SEQ. OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES.

-

--

Michael J. Kleinman Esq.

C/O Law Offices of Michael L. Poindexter\

2132 Montane Dr. E.\

Golden, Colorado 80401

Telephone: 970-328-3986

Facsimile: (303) 526-1981

Alternate Email: Kleinmanlaw@q.com•Cellular Phone 303.359.1825

THE FOREGOING IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION, DIRECTED ONLY TO THE ADDRESSEE. IF YOU HAVE ERRONEOUSLY RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION, PLEASE DELETE THIS E-MAIL AND ALL ATTACHMENTS AND NOTIFY THE SENDER IMMEDIATELY. THE UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OR USE OF ANY INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN OR IN ANY ATTACHMENTS IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED BY SECTION 7-74-102 ET SEQ. OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES.

--
Michael J. Kleinman Esq.
C/O Law Offices of Michael L. Poindexter\
2132 Montane Dr. E.\
Golden, Colorado 80401
Telephone: 970-328-3986
Facsimile: (303) 526-1981
Alternate Email: Kleinmanlaw@q.com•Cellular Phone 303.359.1825

THE FOREGOING IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL
INFORMATION, DIRECTED ONLY TO THE ADDRESSEE. IF YOU
HAVE ERRONEOUSLY RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION, PLEASE
DELETE THIS E-MAIL AND ALL ATTACHMENTS AND NOTIFY THE
SENDER IMMEDIATELY. THE UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OR USE
OF ANY INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN OR IN ANY
ATTACHMENTS IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED BY SECTION 7-74-102 ET
SEQ. OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES.

-
<New Microsoft Word Document (2).pdf>

LIST OF REASONS FOR OPPOSITION TO LAND SWAP AMENDMENT TO
HAYMEADOW PUD MICHAEL AND DORON KLEINMAN 98 SOLEIL
CIRCLE EAGLE, COLORADO 81631

1. Homeowner relied on PUD approved by City which included elementary school at some time in the future adjacent to Soleil Homes subdivision when the home was purchased.
2. Developer asked for the land distribution approved and planned accordingly. Now, because they do not want to pay for development costs upfront that they knew were required to build the high-density, they propose a land swap that only benefits them and no one else.
3. The Rec district was counting on sharing playing fields with the school which will not happen if the land swap happens. The sharing of the recreation facilities just makes sense as a taxpayer.
4. The developers claim that lower cost housing will assist teachers is without merit as there is no school needed at present and if it is needed, they have land they can build upon.
5. The developers work on the road has been dismal at best with delays, mistakes and an attempt to have Soleil Homes pay for work they agreed to perform. What makes you think they can do any better adjacent to the Soleil Subdivision.
6. Traffic will funnel off the road in front of the Soleil Subdivision as the quick way to the proposed project.
7. There is no economic benefit to the City, Recreation District or Soleil Homes to the swap, The only entity that benefits is the developer that admits that it will save millions of dollars of infrastructure costs now and use profits (if that every occurred) to pay for improvements later.
8. Every homeowner relied on the City's PUD approval and there is no good reason to change it to monetarily benefit a private developer who knew at the time of their original submittal that the high-density homes would be as approved. 1
9. The land swap would lead to rapid growth and significantly increase traffic on Brush Creek Road and Capitol Street. Neither being not able to accommodate it without the planned study and additional road improvements that would be very disruptive to the local community.
10. The unsightly and untimeliness of the construction practices of the developer of the road and their disruption of the neighborhood leads me to believe that they are incapable of developing this project in a timely and non-disruptive manner.
11. Due to the original traffic studies done with the PUD approval, the placement of the school was extensively thought through at that time and should not change.

I believe that if you question the developer, you will learn that their pro forma is upside down having spent considerably more on the road that was forecast, and by building the high-density condos on the proposed the land swap would assist them in recovering their losses by using the existing infrastructure in place. This request appears to be for financial reasons and nothing else.

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Fwd: Haymeadow Land Swap e ote es
Date: Monday, October 2 , 2020 11:2 :04 M
Attachments: [Haymeadow Land Swap Rae Sanders.pdf](#)

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Rae Sanders <raepsanders@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2020 11:22:10 AM
To: Jenny Rakow <jenny.rakow@townofeagle.org>
Cc: chad.phillips@townofeagle.org <chad.phillips@townofeagle.org>; Charlie Perkins <charlieperkins@townofeagle.org>; kyle.hoilande@townofeagle.org <kyle.hoilande@townofeagle.org>; Bob Sanders Husband <bobsanders9@yahoo.com>
Subject: Haymeadow Land Swap - We Vote Yes

Hello Jenny,

On September 8th 2020 I submitted the attached email and photos to Angie for submission involving discussions on the Haymeadow Land Swap. At the time Angie discussed with Chad and the advice was I might want to withhold my submission until a more relevant time. I understand that time is upon us.

Jenny, I am submitting my original letters and photos along with a brief summary of what has transpired since then. My neighbors Mike and Linda Claymon shared an email of what they would be sending this morning. Mike and Linda's # 1 states that every homeowner in Soleil relied on the city's PUD approval when purchasing at Soleil, is NOT true for us. We were living in NOLA at the time and visited the Soleil site once before going under contract. At our 1st meeting our town home did not even exist and our sales person did not tell us it would be a school and the property line was right on the other side of the drainage ditch. We were given a much different scenario. We would have NEVER purchased this home if we were aware of this. The first I heard of anything like this is when we went to the HOA year end meeting December of 2019.

In addition to all reasons stated in my email dated September 8th 2020 I am for the Haymeadow Land Swap for the following reasons:

1. Every Soleil homeowner drove past the multi housing project John Purchase had done prior to Soleil before buying in Soleil. There is not a path into our development that escapes this housing. Several homeowners in Soleil are closer to this multi family development than they will ever be to a Haymeadow multi family unit. So if Soleil can exist with that multi family housing why can it not exist with one further away from us?
2. If the Haymeadow swap is allowed to move forward, not one Haymeadow resident will drive through Soleil to get home, because there is no path to Haymeadow from Soleil Circle or Field Street. However, if the school moves forward with building behind Soleil I have heard it would be possible for Field Street to be extended to accommodate the school. That scenario would definitely add traffic to the Soleil neighborhood.

3. Since my first communication with Brandon Cohen on July 27th he has been available to me and has done everything he said he would, including submitting a PUD that has the promised open space between Soleil and Haymeadow. Brandon is willing to commit that no buildings will ever be built in this space. It will strictly be green space for the wildlife to be able to continue on their path to Brush Creek. All of which they continued to do during the construction of Soleil.
4. There is no evidence that building multi family homes offered at \$400.00 a square foot will lower Soleil property values, that is just speculation. Other real estate agents believe the square foot comps could easily raise our property values.
5. A close friend purchased a home in Cordillera north of I-70. After the economic crash in 2008 it took her until 2013 to sell her home. No developer in his right mind would have started a project the size of Haymeadow during those years.
6. Covid has changed everything including real estate. The newspaper's front page has spoken to the record sales in Eagle County which they expect to continue. When Covid hit there was a down time and some talk in the hood that it might be difficult to sell the 5-6 homes left, but they all sold and not at a discount
7. The school offers us no guarantee of a buffer space behind our home. Given all the land in this valley why would we cram a school on top of us when we have the opportunity to spread out and let everyone have some breathing room. A chain link fence like the ones in the photos on other Eagle School property behind the townhouses does not offer such. I cannot even imagine the eye sore of having a chain link fence 30 feet from my backdoor.
8. Brandon has been very clear that this would be a financial benefit to him, however there are also financial benefits to the town. The sooner the 1st group of homes are available for sale the sooner the town starts collecting property taxes for much needed revenue and all the other taxes new residents bring such as taxes on autos and sales tax on all they buy.
9. Some of my neighbors are opposed to Haymeadow because they believe a school will never be built behind the townhomes, but they contradict themselves by being worried the future school would then not be connected to the rec center. That is a conflicting argument.
10. As to the point that this has been a rushed schedule I would disagree. I have been in communication with Brandon since the end of July. There was a 2nd meeting of Soleil homeowners on September 2nd. There were fewer homeowners in attendance than at the 1st meeting. A group email including these owners and others started and I sent the group Brandon's personal email so they all could have access to him and as to my knowledge none reached out to him between that time and the meeting on October 23. That was over a month of time other homeowners could have been participating in the process with Brandon as I was.

Thank you to all for taking the time to allow me to share my ideas and I look forward to speaking at the public hearings. Please record all I have submitted for the public record.

Sincerely,

Rae Sanders



Rae Sanders <raepsanders@gmail.com>

Haymeadow land swap

Rae Sanders <raepsanders@gmail.com>

Tue, Sep 8, 2020 at 3:23 PM

Hello Angie,

We spoke on the phone about three weeks ago in reference to the Haymeadow Land Swap and you asked me to send you a list of my concerns. Some members of the Soleil Circle community are adamant this swap will not take place, however I do not believe they represent the majority of the homeowners. They represent the majority of the homeowners who show up for the meetings. We have had two meetings that I am aware of and a lot more people showed up for the first one than the second meeting on September 2nd. The reason the turnout was smaller is because many neighbors just want to stay neutral and not create ill will with their neighbors.

There are 2 - 3 homeowners that are spearheading this crusade and they are on a mission to stop something they have never seen renderings of. One of these homeowners just wants it stopped because she is tired of living in a construction site. As the developer of Soleil told me that is what you get when you buy into new construction and she bought into a new construction site. I don't believe that is enough of a reason to not at least hear the pros and cons of both sides. How can any of us make an educated rational decision when none of us have seen any renderings??

I first communicated with Brandon Cohen the evening of Monday July 27, 2020. He emailed me because of a letter I sent to Scott Schlosser earlier in the day. At that time I was totally against his development because the rumor mill had said it was going to be a high density development right outside my back door. Since the 1st communication on July 27th I have become very receptive to what Brandon is proposing for three reasons. First he has been extremely transparent and available to me at all times in the last 6 weeks. Secondly, I want the barrier he has proposed behind my home, something the school board does not offer its neighbors as can be seen by the pictures I took of other Eagle schools. I could not bear to have a chain link fence with tents on the other side 15' from my home. The school that is over on Eagle ranch Road actually has a broken fence with a piece of black tarp flapping in the air. How could that possible be better for those of us who back up to the field? As for the other neighbors in Soleil my property is their barrier between the development of either a school or homes. I too would like a barrier and Brandon is offering one to be built before construction of the homes begin. Third, it has been my dream my whole life to move out to this valley and my husband and I finally decided to do it last year. My husband's granddaughter will be graduating college and wants to move out here, however even with the \$100,000 deposit her family would give her for a new home she would not have entry into this valley if she wanted new construction.

The neighbors are also concerned that the traffic patterns will change in Soleil. Mathematically if 800 homes have been approved for development the same amount of cars will pass down Brush Creek road to go to a home that is 350 feet away or a half of a mile away. None of us including me understand why the town plans on getting rid of the original Brush Creek road because it could be useful to direct the Sylvan Lake traffic that way as well as construction vehicles. This would also be most helpful to the Soleil residents who back up to the new road who were told the barrier between their home and the road would be much wider and larger. So why let go of a perfectly fine existing road? Brandon tells me this has nothing to do with his project that this is a town decision. I would like to discuss this with the town.

From my correspondence with Brandon it is my understanding the first phase of multi family homes will be approximately 900 square feet of affordable housing, not low end housing. His design team worked on The Base Camp project so they have good taste! His team plans on selling these new homes for \$400.00 a square foot. Once again how does that hurt the surrounding home owners, we did not pay that for our homes. This could be a huge value increase in our existing homes, once again a good thing not a bad thing.

I tried to explain all of this to the homeowners at the 1st Soleil meeting however while the rest of us were sitting on the ground a member of our HOA who stood the whole time told me Brandon was "playing me" and I was foolish to believe him. After that no one really cared to hear what I had to say. I knew the answer to a lot of their questions but I was discounted after that meeting. The first thing we all learn in business is not to write down anything that is not true because it will come back to bite you. Brandon has written everything he has promised in emails that I could forward to the whole world if he did not do what he said. He also has to present to the town all of this before any decisions can be made. So if Brandon promises me a barrier I can assure you it will be on his proposal to the town because he does not want me sitting in a town council meeting waving any unfulfilled promises to the council.

The second Soleil circle meeting was on September 2nd and I went to that meeting knowing most in attendance would be against me and they were. The other interesting thing was how many less people attended the 2nd meeting. As explained to me by one of my neighbors she did not want to get in the middle of this fight and wanted to stay neutral. Those neighbors did not come. So let me share what the people who came had to say. The most troubling thing I heard was from a couple I do not know, but the husband shared his concerns about having those kinds of people that do shift work and other undesirables who drive their work truck homes in his neighborhood. In this new world we are living in, it seems we should all be doing our best to be more inclusive and inviting to others and not judge a person as not being a good neighbor because they do shift work. I think we would all agree we are grateful for the nurses and doctors who do shift work. I also expressed to my neighbors that my husband's granddaughter wanted to move here but would not be able to afford any new construction in the valley even with her father's help. This is a young woman who would be an asset to our community. She is also who Brandon's project is looking for. There is a trend in the market on all levels for 20 to 30 year old people wanting smaller housing. They do not want to leave the same footprint that my generation has and they don't need the amount of stuff most of my generation needed. Again this is a bad thing and not a good thing?

Soleil circle has a realtor who owns a home that backs up to the field, however it is income property for her and she does not live in Soleil. So what happens in that field does not affect her daily life as it would mine. She stated at the last meeting (she did not attend the first one)

she was against the land swap and that is her right to be. She also offered introductions to town council members to discuss their unhappiness with the swap. I expressed to her and the employee of mountain rec (who owns a home in Soleil) that I was concerned about what would happen to my home's value and more importantly my peace and serenity if the town decided to build a field or parking lot 15' from my back fence. They both indicated they did not think that would ever happen. Again please see the attached photos showing what the town has done with other schools in our area where they create boundaries with their property. I have no reason to believe the school or town will not do the same behind my home. I have every reason to believe that Brandon Cohen offers me a different barrier that will also allow the elk and deer to continue to move through this field to find water. I also am not a realtor however I am heavily invested in real estate and yes a school is a plus for a community, however where I am from the homes that are in the direct path of the school or connected to the school sell for less a square foot and take much longer to sell than the houses 6 blocks away. I do not want my new home devalued, who would?

The other big issue for the neighbors against the swap is the wealth of Brandon Cohen's family. They see giving into this project as helping a wealthy family and why should they do such a thing? Let me answer that as someone who has spent a lifetime having businesses that had a wealthy clientele. Number one, many wealthy people spend their money building and improving things that employ contractors, sub contractors, consultants, landscapers etc...

People are able to support their families and businesses because of wealthy families who build things. Once again why is having a wealthy family with deep pockets wanting to employ people and businesses in our community a bad thing? Also they perceive Brandon as being too young to take on such a bold project. I have two arguments for that idea. Number one as stated by the realtor who attended our second meeting Brandon is surrounding himself with good consultants. That is a sign that he knows what he does not know and is smart enough to surround himself with people who know the right answers. Secondly, in my opinion this young man has much more character than the trust fund kids I know back in New Orleans who do nothing but self indulge with their unearned wealth. Brandon Cohen could be doing the same, but he has chosen to have a for profit business that he believes will benefit the valley his family has been connected to since he was a child. Again can someone please tell me why this is a bad thing?

In closing Angie I would ask that you pass this along to Chad so that I too can have meetings with the decision makers of this project.

Thanks so much,

Rae Sanders

5 attachments

Screenshot_20200903-161934_Gallery.jpg
1458K









From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: F : Oppose Haymeadow School Land Swap
Date: Thursday, October 2, 2020 12:00:3 PM

From: Tim Ryan <trye41@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 28, 2020 4:54 PM
To: Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; David Gaboury <david.g@townofeagle.org>
Subject: Oppose Haymeadow School Land Swap

Hello,

I am a homeowner in the Soleil neighborhood, and I would like to formally express my opposition to the proposed land swap from the Haymeadow developer that is adjacent to Soleil Homes.

Tim Ryan
719.313.6138

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: F : Haymeadow Letter to Town of Eagle Council
Date: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 10:45:33 AM
Attachments: [Haymeadow Letter to Town of Eagle.doc](#) .pdf
[image001.png](#)

From: Becca Gould <becca@veilsofvail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2020 9:44 AM
To: Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>; Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; david.gbours@townofeagle.org
Subject: Haymeadow - Letter to Town of Eagle Council

Hello,

Please see the attached letter to the Town of Eagle Council regarding the Haymeadow PUD Application.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

--Thank you,

Becca M. Gould
Owner of Veils of Vail & Creative Director
Becca@veilsofvail.com
512.809.6262
www.veilsofvail.com



November 17th, 2020

Dear Members of the Town of Eagle Council,

I am writing to you on behalf of the local wedding and event industry professionals in support of the approval on the Haymeadow PUD Application. As a local resident of Eagle County for 7 years, and business owner, this proposed venue would highly benefit our local community of residents, specifically those whom reside in the town of Eagle, that are looking for a special event venue, and the business that could generate income from servicing the needs of the those whom book the Haymeadow venue for their event or wedding.

As a resident of Eagle, Colorado, it is at times inconvenient that there are a very limited number of locations in our awesome mountain town that can accommodate a private event such that the Haymeadow venue could provide our local community and residents with, without the 30 mile drive up valley. Having a venue close by to host events at would be not only convenient, it would showcase our beautiful town and be a great addition to our growing community.

Our industry is in a direction that is always growing and conceptualizing new ideas, just like the town of Eagle. The hard working families and business owners of Eagle would not only have a nice venue close by to host memorable celebrations and joyous occasions, but by approving this application, it could generate more business opportunities and be an enticing attraction for those who want to explore our quaint mountain town.

Please consider the continuous drive and resilience that our local event and wedding professionals have after enduring all of the hardships caused by the ongoing pandemic. We want to generate income, support other local businesses, and connect with our local community. By approving the Haymeadow PUD Application, it will have a significantly positive impact on our expanding community, and be a highly sought after local business that also supports other local businesses by their operations.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Becca M. Gould
Owner of Veils of Vail Wedding Planning
Becca@veilsofvail.com
20 Wren Court
Eagle, CO 81631

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: F : Support or the Haymeadow Project
Date: Monday, October 23, 2020 15:35 M
Attachments: [HaymeadowSupportLetter.doc](#)

From: Caitlin Caldwell <caitlin@vailvintagemagnolia.com>
Sent: Monday, November 16, 2020 4:29 PM
To: Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>; Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; david.gboury@townofeagle.org
Subject: Support for the Haymeadow Project

Hello All!

I have heard word of the Haymeadow Project, specifically the Cabin Activation that would create a new venue here in the Vail Valley. I wanted to pass along my support with the attached letter.

Please let me know if you have any questions. Thanks for all you do for our community and stay healthy!

Caitlin

--

Owner/Lead Wedding Sales
Vintage Magnolia
970-926-5000
www.vailvintagemagnolia.com
[Follow us](#) * [Friend us](#) * [Pinterest](#)

Note: I am out of the office on Wednesdays and Sundays. Typically off-site on Saturdays.



Monday, November 16th, 2021

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a local business owner and have worked in the Event Industry here in the Vail Valley for almost 15 years. I wanted to take a few moments to share my support and voice the need for a local, community focused venue that highlights the beauty of our area. Please know that I am in full support of the Haymeadow Project and for the Cabin Activation.

My shop, Vintage Magnolia is a high-end retail shop and florist. Events are a big part of our business and I am extremely familiar with all of the venues here in the Vail Valley. Our Valley lacks a venue without a corporate feel- one that draws visitors to the charm of the mountains- one they won't see anywhere else- one that showcases what the locals love about the area- one that brings destinations to the Vail Valley vs. Aspen, Summit County, etc. It sounds as if the Haymeadow Cabin will be just that!

Destination weddings bring a great deal of revenue to Valley. The wedding itself of course, but they also bring an increase in hotel revenue, sales to local retail stores, restaurants, etc. They also bring visitors from all over the country, drawing them back to visit us again. An option like this will help build the local economy and bring strength to the local events industry which has taken a blow due to COVID. It sounds as if the Haymeadow Cabin will also create a place for locals to gather for smaller sized community events and fundraisers, which is always a positive!

I am in full support!!

Best:

Caitlin Caldwell

Vintage Magnolia

caitlin@vailvintagemagnolia.com

970-926-5000

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Peyton Heitzman](#)
Subject: Fwd: Letter in Support o HayMeadow
Date: Monday, o ember 30, 2020 :32:54 PM
Attachments: [J Pletcher _1 letter_ or town 11.2.doc](#)

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Jennifer Pletcher <jennifer@geminieventplanning.com>
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2020 6:04:10 PM
To: Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>; Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; david.gboursy@townofeagle.org <david.gboursy@townofeagle.org>
Subject: Letter in Support of HayMeadow

Hello Council and Community members,

Please see my letter in support of the new Haymeadow Project. Please contact me with any questions or if I can be of further assistance.

--

****PLEASE ALLOW 48 HOURS FOR EMAIL RESPONSE. We are out of office Saturdays and Sundays September-May.****

Office Hours:

Mon, Tue, Wed Thu | 4:00-6:00pm

Fri, Sat | 9:00-12:00pm

jennifer pletcher

owner :: creative director and lead event producer

305.587.1130

PO Box 3707 Vail CO 81658

insta :: [@gemweddingsvail](#)

web :: www.geminieventplanning.com

October 30, 2020

To: Mayor Turnipseed and Eagle Town Councilpersons

(Turnipseed, Jessen, Kerst, Solomon, Palmer, Bodenheimer, Gboursy)

RE: Haymeadow PUD Amendment Support

Delivered via email

Dear Mayor and Eagle Town Councilpersons,

My name is Jennifer Pletcher and I am the owner of Gemini Event Planning. My company specializes in wedding and event planning and implementation in Eagle County. I was recently asked to work with the Haymeadow Development Team to consult on the reactivation of the existing "Ranch Manager's Cabin" as a wedding and events venue. My role included providing wedding and event data, site plan feedback and suggestions. I also leant my expertise in terms of explaining trends in the wedding business and, specifically the wedding business in Eagle and Eagle County.

My first reaction was, "of course" there is always demand for additional wedding space in Eagle County. Once I saw the space and surrounding land and heard the Haymeadow Team's vision of quality for the cabin area, I became much more passionate about its success, which is why I'm writing to express my hope that you will approve the Haymeadow PUD amendment application. In my opinion, the natural landscape and views rival any of Eagle County's existing and most sought after wedding places. To me, as a local who was born here in Eagle County, this is as much about providing a venue for clients as it is supporting local businesses and vendors, especially after such a challenging year this last year.

Plans for the restoration of the cabin are extensive and directly in line with the types of weddings and events space that I'm regularly approached by clients to secure for their special day. The flexibility to configure the space for small, medium and large events further secures its attractiveness and usability. Plans to activate new deck and lawn space, all with great views up the Brush Creek Valley, are functional, attractive and are also in line with what clients are looking for.

Brandon Cohen's vision for the cabin event space is upscale and will provide a sophisticated wedding and events venue that allows Eagle (and Eagle County) businesses and vendors to maximize their involvement in as many as 20 weddings per year, and numerous other events such as fundraisers, birthday parties and family reunions. He has continually expressed the desire to have this be an economic engine for the local business community and of his desire to incent parties to choose and work with local vendors.

I also recognize that there is a second part to the Haymeadow PUD Amendment application that does not pertain specifically to the cabin reactivation, but rather a density and land swap between the developer and Eagle County School District. I'm equally supportive of this portion

of the application. Though my husband and I already own a home in Edwards, we looked in Eagle and I have friends and colleagues who want to buy in Eagle if the right home was available at the right price. It's well known that residents of Eagle County don't have many options for housing. Building more already approved multifamily housing units sooner, definitely makes sense.

Thank you for considering my perspective. I hope you will approve the Haymeadow PUD amendment.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Pletcher
Owner, Gemini Event Planning

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: F : Letter o Support or Haymeadow e elopment
Date: ednesday, eember 2, 2020 11:1 :2 M
Attachments: [Heymedow Letter 1.pd](#)

From: Fletcher Harrison <fletcher@redmaplecatering.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 2, 2020 10:30 AM
To: Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; david.gboursy@townofeagle.org; Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>
Cc: Jason Harrison <jason@redmaplecatering.com>
Subject: Letter of Support for Haymeadow Development

hank you to the town o agle,

e wanted to share our thoughts on this with all o you. his looks like an e citing way to provide a uni ue olorado e perience or years to come

From all o us on the the Red Maple team,

Fletcher Harrison
Director of Operations & Owner
Red Maple Hospitality
Office: 970-445-3102
Cell: 970-331-5968
fletcher@redmaplecatering.com

To: Eagle Town Council (Turnipseed, Jessen, Kerst, Solomon, Palmer, Bodenheimer, Gbours)

Cc: Jenny Rakow, Town Clerk

Re: Haymeadow PUD Amendment Support

Email delivery

12/1/2020

To whom it may concern,

I recently had the opportunity to speak with members of the Haymeadow development team regarding their amendment application to the Town of Eagle. I understand that their application has two parts.

- 1) Turning the cabin near the Haymaker Trail into a highly desirable wedding and event venue
- 2) Swapping the location of multifamily units from neighborhoods B&C onto the existing school site near the BMX track and moving the school site into neighborhood C

First, I support the remodel of the cabin. My business partner Jason Harrison and I own Red Maple Catering, an Eagle-based catering company servicing weddings and events throughout Eagle County. It's widely known in our business that more and higher quality indoor/outdoor venues are in demand. Simply, there are more people who want to get married in Eagle and Eagle County than there are spaces to accommodate them. The addition of a venue like the one described to me is sure to be busy and help support local businesses who work in the wedding and events industry. It's also widely accepted that communities that can host weddings and events see the trickle down benefits of having groups of out of town guests visiting and spending money in our communities. Haymeadow's plan to incent venue users to utilize local vendors only further sweetens the pot for local businesses like ours.

Secondly, the "swap" part of the application is less in my area of expertise, but I do know that quality workforce housing like Haymeadow is proposing is hard to find. As our business anticipates ramping up to meet pent up demand in 2021, we are planning to hire five additional staff. Unfortunately, our biggest challenge may be finding good workers who can find local housing.

Since the 112 units that Haymeadow is proposing to add to the first phase of construction are already approved in their existing plan I think it makes sense to provide them sooner to meet local housing demands. I understand that if the Haymeadow plan

stays "as is" those same units are probably more than a decade from being built. All indicators show that we need them now.

Please approve the Haymeadow application that you are reviewing. We need more quality event spaces, and certainly need more housing.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'F' followed by a long, horizontal, wavy line that tapers off to the right.

Fletcher Harrison
Owner & Director of Operations, Red Maple Catering
Eagle, CO

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: F : R LLetter o Support or Haymeadow venue
Date: Thursday, December 3, 2020 1:25:11 PM
Attachments: [HaymeadowP_Support_Four 13 esigns.pdf](#)

From: Lauren Benson <lauren@four13designs.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 1:25 PM
To: Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>; Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; david.gboury@townofeagle.org
Subject: EXTERNALLetter of Support for Haymeadow Venue

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi All,

Please see the attached support letter in regards to the haymeadow venue and let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you!

Lauren Benson

www.four13design.com | 970.471.6935 | lauren@four13designs.com

Let's connect:



December 3, 2020

Dear Mayor Turnipseed, and Eagle Town Councilpersons;

Re: **Haymeadow PUD Amendment Support** (Delivered via email)

My name is Lauren Benson, I am the owner of Four 13 Designs, a graphic design studio located in Eagle that primarily works in the wedding industry creating custom invitations and other paperie for weddings. I have owned and operated this business in the Eagle County since 2011. I own a home in eagle and 95%+ of my clients are having their events locally.

I would like to send my full suppoort to the approval of the Haymeadow PUD and its amendment application. I feel that there is a lack of venues that directly benefit our local community and I feel this Haymeadow PUU would help provide that.

Thank you for your consideration.

I hope you will approve the Haymeadow PUD amendment.

Sincereley,

Lauren Benson

Owner, Four 13 Designs
PO Box 5444, Eagle, CO 81631
970.471.6935
lauren@four13designs.com

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: F : R LHaymeadow P usiness Support
Date: hursday, eceember 3, 2020 :2 :33 M

From: Jenny Nelson <jenny@nateandjennyweddings.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 9:19 AM

To: Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>; Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; david.gboury@townofeagle.org

Subject: EXTERNALHaymeadow PUD Business Support

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

December 3, 2020

Dear Mayor Turnipseed, and Eagle Town Councilpersons;

Re: **Haymeadow PUD Amendment Support** (Delivered via email)

My name is Jenny Nelson, I am the co owner of Nate and Jenny Weddings, a wedding photography business that my husband and I have owned and operated in Vail for over a decade. We specialize in high end weddings in Eagle County. We own two homes in the Valley and have worked hard with our industry to sustain full time residents and life in our valley by keeping our life and business focus local.

I would like to send my full support to the approval of the Haymeadow PUD and its amendment application. We need to provide additional event venues that are a direct benefit to our local community and not to a multinational hotel organization.

Event Venues, such as Donovan Pavilion, support our local small businesses and families. These businesses are in desperate need for an additional venue like the Haymeadow PUD to help them recover after suffering such a downturn in business after this years pandemic. The Haymeadow PUD will continue to provide revenue for our Valley and small businesses for years to come. This will help small businesses and families stay in the Valley.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

I hope you will approve the Haymeadow PUD amendment.

I can be reached at 720-299-4661 or at jenny@nateandjennyweddings.com for further comment.

Sincerely,

Jenny P. Nelson

Owner, Nate and Jenny Weddings
4041 Bighorn Road
Vail, CO 81657

Jenny P. Nelson

Nate and Jenny Weddings
jenny@nateandjennyweddings.com
720.299.4661

www.nateandjennyweddings.com
vail-santa barbara-worldwide



From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: F : R LSupport or Haymeadow P mendment
Date: Thursday, December 3, 2020 12:42:55 PM
Attachments: [Support or Haymeadow P mendment Jesse Starr.pdf](#)

From: Jesse Starr <jesse@twoelkstudios.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 9:26 AM
To: Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>; Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; david.gboury@townofeagle.org
Cc: Jens Werner <jens@wernercommunication.com>
Subject: EXTERNALSupport for Haymeadow PUD Amendment

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

Please see my attached letter of support for the proposed Haymeadow PUD amendment.

Thank you.

--

Best,
Jesse

Two Elk Studios (Formerly Jesse Starr Photography)
e. jesse@twoelkstudios.com | o. 970-325-2258 | d. 970-632-2508

Custom Photographic Experiences for *Weddings, Families, High School Seniors, Pets, and More.*

Visit TwoElkStudios.com to begin your journey!

Weddings/Portraits/Family/Pets: <http://twoelkstudios.com>
Commercial/Advertising: <http://jessestarrproductions.com>

Insta: [TwoElkStudios](#) | Facebook: [Two Elk Studios](#)

December 1, 2020

To: Mayor Turnipseed and Eagle Town Councilpersons
(Turnipseed, Jessen, Kerst, Solomon, Palmer, Bodenheimer,
Gboury)
RE: Haymeadow PUD Amendment Support
Delivered via email

Dear Mayor and Eagle Town Councilpersons,

My name is Jesse Starr and I am the owner of Two Elk Studios, a luxury photography company with a studio in Edwards. We specialize in photography for weddings and events in Eagle County. I have lived and operated in Eagle County for almost 10 years.

I would like to send my full support to the approval of the Haymeadow PUD amendment application. We need to provide additional event venues and support our local event businesses, who will really need it to recover after this pandemic has left us.

Thank you for considering my perspective. I hope you will approve the Haymeadow PUD amendment.

I can be reached at 970-632-2508 or jesse@twoelkstudios.com for further comment if desired.

Sincerely,

Jesse D Starr
Owner, Two Elk Studios

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: F : R LHaymeadow P mendment Support
Date: Thursday, December 3, 2020 1:22:4 PM

From: Carrie Stockert <carriestockert@me.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 1:14 PM
To: Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>; Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; david.gboury@townofeagle.org
Subject: EXTERNALHaymeadow PUD Amendment Support

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

December 3, 2020

To: Mayor Turnipseed, and Eagle Town Councilpersons;
(Turnipseed, Jessen, Kerst, Solomon, Palmer, Bodenheimer, Gboury)

Re: **Haymeadow PUD Amendment Support** (Delivered via email)

Dear Mayor and Eagle Town Councilpersons,

My name is Carrie Stockert, I am the owner of Carrie Stockert Makeup Artist, a wedding makeup business that I have owned and operated in Vail for over 20 years. I specialize in high end weddings in Eagle County. I own my home in the Valley and have worked hard with our industry to sustain full time residents and life in our valley by keeping our life and business focus local.

I would like to send my full support to the approval of the Haymeadow PUD and its amendment application. We need to provide additional event venues that are a direct benefit to our local community and not to a multinational hotel organization.

Event Venues, such as Donovan pavillion, support our local small businesses and families. These businesses are in desperate need for an additional venue like the Haymeadow PUD to help them recover after suffering such a downturn in business after this years pandemic. The Haymeadow PUD will continue to provide revenue for our valley and small businesses for years to come. This will help small businesses and families stay in the Vail Valley.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

I hope you will approve the Haymeadow PUD amendment.

I can be reached at (970)376-4836 or carriestockert@me.com for further comment.

Sincerely,

Carrie Stockert

Owner, Carrie Stockert Makeup Artist
0113 Mill Loft Street
Unit B 208
Edwards, CO 81632

Professional Makeup Artist & Beauty Advisor
(970)376-4836
<https://www.instagram.com/carriestockert/>

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Fwd: R LLetter o Support or Haymeadow enue
Date: Friday, eceember 4, 2020 :0 :13 M
Attachments: [MMS Letter or Haymeadow.pd](#)

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Marguerite McEvoy Shipman <eventsbymarguerite@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 3, 2020 8:59:56 PM

To: Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>; Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>

Subject: EXTERNALLetter of Support for Haymeadow Venue

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please see my attached letter!

Marguerite McEvoy Shipman

404-247-3565

www.eventsbymarguerite.com



Please note my office hours are 9am-5pm MST Monday-Friday.

Email is my preferred method of communication however if there is an emergency please call or text me.

December 2, 2020

Dear Mayor and Eagle Town Councilpersons,

My name is Marguerite Shipman and I am the owner of Events by Marguerite, an event planning company here in Eagle County. I execute events such as weddings, baby showers, birthday parties, anniversary parties, engagement parties and the like.

I am writing to voice my support of the Haymeadow event space and housing development and to express my hope that you will approve the Haymeadow PUD amendment application.

My clients are always asking me for different venue recommendations and I would love to have the opportunity to give them a locally owned, small business as an option. I also think that this type of venue, spruced up rustic with amazing views, is EXACTLY what a lot of my clientele is looking for in an event space when they come up to the mountains.

The great thing about adding a new event venue to Eagle County is that not only will we bring business to Eagle County and this particular venue, but other local vendors such as florists, musicians, rental companies and planners will have more opportunities to grow their businesses and expand with another outlet for events. Especially after the hit that the event industry took in 2020, this is an amazing opportunity for our community!

Thank you for your consideration. I hope you will approve the Haymeadow PUD amendment.

Sincerely,

Marguerite McEvoy Shipman
Owner, Events by Marguerite
404-247-3565
Eventsbymarguerite@gmail.com

From: [Rick Messmer](#)
To: [lerk roup](#); [Scott urnipseed](#); [ndy Jessen](#); [Pappy erst](#); [Matt Solomon](#); [dam Palmer](#); [llen odenhemier](#); [da id.gboury townno eagle.org](#); [Planning and oning](#)
Subject: R LHaymeadow Letter O Support
Date: ednesday, ecember , 2020 1:40:4 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[Haymeadow Support Letter.doc](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

All,

Thank you all for what you do! Please see letter attached in support of the proposed swap of neighborhood densities within Haymeadow.

Thank You Very Much,

Rick Messmer

The Messmer Group
Berkshire Hathaway HomeServices – Eagle Ranch
Managing Broker
Cell: 970.376.0041
Office: 970.328.2482
Email: rick@bhhsvail.net
Website: www.rickmessmer.com

One Day Forward | One Day
STRONGER
#doingmypartcolorado

Wire Fraud Alert: You will never receive wiring instructions from me.
All wire instructions will be emailed from the title company via an encrypted email system.

To: Town of Eagle Mayor and Councilpersons
(Turnipseed, Jessen, Kerst, Solomon, Palmer, Bodenheimer, Gbours)
&
Town of Eagle Planning & Zoning Commission Members
(Perkins, Holland, Hood, Webb, Gregg, Nutkins, Townsend, Winkler)

Cc: Jenny Rakow, Town Clerk, clerk@townofeagle.org

Re: Support for Haymeadow Density Swap Amendment

**delivered via email
December 8 2020**

Dear Mayor Turnipseed, Eagle Town Councilpersons, and Planning & Zoning Commission members, please accept this letter as indication of my support for the Haymeadow PUD amendment that is currently under review.

As a resident of Eagle, I'm excited to see our community grow and continue to add the critical, yet measured, mass that will better support our local economy. Eagle continues to attract people who are committed to living full time in Eagle County and, in many cases, serve as our vital workforce and the character of our community.

As an Eagle-based Realtor, I see the demand for housing for locals and local families firsthand. I support the proposed multi family unit/school site "SWAP" primarily because it allows 112 already approved housing units to be built in Haymeadow's first neighborhood, starting next year. The demand for housing is here now. Why would we wait years until the development of Haymeadow reaches the outlying neighborhoods to provide something so acutely needed today? Further, there doesn't seem to be an immediate need for a school on the currently approved site. This sensible change to the plan impacts very few neighbors, but stands to benefit many in the community who rely on locals to support their businesses and people working to find a quality "for sale" home.

Anecdotally, an Eagle multifamily unit similar to the units Haymeadow is proposing recently sold above asking price in only a few days. Currently there are only 6 available "for sale" units listed in Eagle and only two of those units are available below the list price of \$1.85M. Our supply nowhere near meets demand to live in Eagle.

Since there is no change in overall density or traffic, it really becomes an issue of timing. After waiting patiently for years, let's make up for lost time and get this project built.

I hope you will approve the Haymeadow PUD amendment application.

Sincerely,

Rick Messmer

Rick Messmer
Managing Broker, Berkshire Hathaway HomeServices Colorado Properties, Eagle Ranch

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: F : R LLetter o Support Haymeadow ent enue
Date: ednesday, eember , 2020 12:3 :35 PM

From: Nick Junker <nick@ctavideoproductions.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 9, 2020 12:36 PM
To: Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>; Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; david.gboury@townofeagle.org
Subject: EXTERNALLetter of Support Haymeadow Event Venue

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Mayor and Eagle Town Councilpersons,

Thank you for your time and consideration.

My name is Nicholas Junker and I am the owner of Capture The Action Video Productions, we are a professional video production company specializing in producing marketing content for local businesses in the Vail Valley.

I would like to send my full support to the approval of the Haymeadow PUD amendment. We need to provide additional event venues and support our local event businesses, by continuing to invest in such projects as the Haymeadow PUD.

This year has been the year of "pivoting," as all local businesses have needed to develop new systems to keep the foundation of their products and services moving forward. A similar pivot by investing in the Haymeadow PUD, would be a huge step in the right direction and much needed support from our local government, by allowing for more opportunities for local businesses to thrive and pull themselves back on track after this devastating year of a global pandemic.

Again, thank you for taking the time to consider my perspective.

I hope you will approve the Haymeadow PUD amendment.

Thank you,

Nick Junker
415.419.4444
Capture The Action Productions
nick@ctavideoproductions.com

From: [Matthew Owens](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: R LHaymeadow Land Swap
Date: Thursday, December 10, 2020 1:53:4 PM
Attachments: [Haymeadow Land Swap Ob ection Owens 12 10 2020.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jessica,

Please find attached a copy of my letter expressing my opposition to the recently filed Haymeadow PUD Major Amendment (File # PUDA 20-01). I am not sure on the procedure for the Town of Eagle Planning Dept. approval/rejection and whether we the public have a say in such matters. However, I thought I would reach out to you since you are listed as the staff contact for the application.[]

As a resident of the Soleil development, we have also seen documents that are not actually included on the Town's web-site such as a sketch of the site plan, elevations of the proposed buildings - are the Town likely to approve this major amendment without seeing these additional documents and how they may affect the area such as lack of parking being allocated?

Could you also please indicate when the public are allowed to comment on this to the Planning/Zoning meeting? I know there are a number of residents who feel strongly about this and sure they would appreciate and opportunity to speak to the PZ Commission.[]

Also, could you also please confirm whether the Town of Eagle has any guarantee that the Developer will actually continue to build beyond the first phase? Having spoken with the developer's representative they have informed us that they are not obligated to continue building beyond phase 1. Given their issues with funding (this land swap being due to their lack of funding) this leads me to believe they are planning on walking away after phase 1 which would lead the Eagle County School District being stuck with land that is far away from housing and with no infrastructure.[] Not to mention that the development would not even be half finished and the surrounding area looking a mess.

Thanks

Matt Owens

49 Soleil Circle

Dear Jessica,

I am writing to you all to express my opposition to the recently filed Haymeadow PUD Major Amendment (File # PUDA 20-01). I am not sure on the procedure for the Town of Eagle Planning Dept. approval/rejection and whether we the public have a say in such matters. However, I thought I would reach out to you since you are listed as the staff contact for the application.

The following are a list of bullet points which relate directly to the recently published Elevate Eagle document:

- Page 46 indicates that the Haymeadow development is assigned to be Medium Density Residential. The proposed swap will have 8 Buildings of 24 Units each all within close proximity to each other, this is just on the parcel of land being swapped not even including the rest of Neighborhood A1. This is does not appear to be Medium Density and is in fact High Density.
- Page 53 states Higher density neighborhoods should be located near commercial centers and major corridors. The Haymeadow development is not near any commercial center or major corridor, so unsure why the Town of Eagle would consider this swap to high density when it would be located in Eagle Ranch and not in accordance with the above Elevate Eagle document.
- Page 65 – “Goal 2-1.1 New development, additions, and renovations should aim to mimic the scale, architectural style, and character of existing and surrounding historic buildings.” I do not see how multiple 3 story buildings and the high-density multi-family family housing proposed in this swap mimic’s the character of the surrounding area in the Eagle Ranch area.
- Page 64- “Goal 1-1.1 Ensure a healthy mix of housing types and densities (e.g. Single-family, duplex, multifamily, mixed use, and accessory dwelling units) to allow for greater diversity.” This proposed swap by the developer does not represent this and is not a healthy mix, in fact from the plans shared with the Soleil residents it shows buildings clustered together. Also there would be no other multi-family housing included in the other neighborhoods again not conforming to a healthy mix of housing types.
- Page 66 – “Goal 2-3.3a Ensure residential infill and redevelopment blend appropriately with the character and scale of surrounding neighborhoods.” Per my above statement this does not blend with the surrounding properties in Eagle Ranch.
- Page 71 – “Goal 3-4.2 Maintain existing public land boundaries, unless the public benefits realized by a land trade or exchange clearly outweigh any negative impacts”. This proposed swap of school land does not appear to benefit anyone except the developer by reducing their infrastructure costs. The swap of land negatively impacts the community by reducing the ability for shared spaces between Mountain Rec. and the School. Additionally, the Town’s ability to hold bike races and tournaments will be affected by not having access to the land for parking, which will have a negative effect on revenue for the town.

- Page 69 – “Goal 2-8.1 Support and preserve the attributes and quality of the “country lane” experience along Brush Creek Road.” I am not fully aware of what the Town of Eagle is deeming to be a “country lane” feel but having high-density multi-family housing along this corridor does not in my opinion seem to indicate a “country lane” appearance.

The following are a list of bullet points that relate to the PUD Amendment document issued by the Developer to the Town of Eagle.

- The amendment document makes multiple references to 2010 Eagle Area Community Plan (EACP), has this document not been superseded by the recently published Elevate Eagle document? If so then any references to the EACP are no longer applicable and should be amended to suit Elevate Eagle.
- Page 9 states that this land swap “will allow Haymeadow to better respond to the current housing demand for entry level attainably priced units”. While I acknowledge the area needs more affordable workforce housing, meeting housing demand should not be accomplished at the long-term cost of the efficiencies created by shared facilities between the Eagle County School District (ECSD) and Mountain Rec.
- Is the Developer under any obligation to finish the Haymeadow development once neighborhood A1 is complete? Are they under an agreement with the Town of Eagle to finish neighborhoods B, C etc.? As a new resident who lives nearby I am led to believe that the development team start planning for this project in 2005. Unfortunately, it appears they sat on it and did nothing, which resulted in a rush to start the infrastructure works before their permit expired. The result of their inability to plan has cause them to overspend on the infrastructure work, and it now it appears their proposed land swap is so they can build the cheaper and more profitable high-density multi-family housing clustered in one phase so they can sell and recoup some of the money lost to date. This is not an issue Eagle should have to deal with and leads me to believe that neighborhoods B, C etc. will not be finished thus leaving ECSD with land not near housing.
- Page 19 Note 2 – the developer is stating that they do not believe that the amendment has a substantial adverse effect upon any lands abutting or within the PUD. This proposed amendment certainly affects the properties of Soleil, some of which paid a premium for mountain views which are going to be affected by multiple 3 story properties being constructed within close range.
- Page 19 Note 3 – the developer is stating that the proposed land swap is not solely beneficial to one person. This land swap directly benefits the developer as it results in their ability to save significant money by utilizing the infrastructure which was intended for the school and instead use it for the multi-family housing thus creating cheaper construction costs and maximizing their potential profits. Also as previously mentioned this swap negatively benefits the community by omitting shared facilities between the ECSD and Mountain Rec.

- Page 20 Note 5 – the developer states that the proposed amendment does not differ in the approved open space quality. Has there been a study to see what the effect the high density multi-family housing will have on the surrounding wildlife?
- Page 20 Note 6 – the developer states that there are no significant changes to the existing utility plans. I would be surprised that there are no changes given that there would be a significant increase in surface paving and therefore surely an increase in stormwater capacity requirements.
- Page 21 – the developer states that the revised application promotes a healthful and convenient distribution of population. With clustered high density multi-family housing and an additional 112 units to neighborhood A1 this does not appear to be a healthy mix.
- The traffic study accompanying the PUD Amendment – I would question how a traffic study can be accurate when the amendment document does not mention the number of bedrooms for these units or the number of parking spaces. There is no indication of how many added vehicles this land swap could create.
- With the proposed land swap and the school being located in neighborhood C, this could potentially cause significant traffic issues around the junction of Ouzel Lane.
- Has there been any research into how the morning drop-off and afternoon pick-up traffic for the school could conflict with the proposed Fire Station within close proximity? There could be issues if there is an emergency call and pick school traffic times.

The following are a list of bullet points that relate to documents seen by the residents of the Soleil Development that do not appear to be included within the application on the Town of Eagle website.

- The developer has shared initial sketches of the proposed new units with the residents of Soleil (see attached). The proposed redesign does not capture the Town of Eagle parking code requirement and falls short by at least 52 parking spaces. The proposed redesign indicates that there would be 8 buildings each consisting of 24 Units, based on these plans we are able to determine this would be 20 (2 bedroom units) and 4 (1 bedroom units). Using the Town of Eagle code of 2 spaces for 2 bedrooms and 1-1/2 spaces for 1 bedroom this proposed redesign would require 368 parking spaces. The current sketches indicate 316 spaces including parking garages. These quantities also do not include for any visitor parking. This leads to substantial lack of dedicated parking which could result in parking being backed up on Brush Creek Road and surrounding roads which in turn would result in significant traffic issues and most likely accidents.
- As mentioned above I have serious concerns about the Developer and their obligations to finish the Haymeadow development beyond neighborhood A1. It has taken them 17 years to get to this point which shows very inadequate planning and then the subsequent rush to start construction before their permit expired. In rushing this through before permit expiration we as residents of the surrounding work area have seen two years of infrastructure work which has resulted in numerous mistakes on piping and drainage layouts resulting in constant digging

work. Now that the developer is suffering financially as a result of this mismanagement they are proposing the land swap so they can hopefully make a quick profit on selling multi-family housing (cheaper construction costs). In conversations with the developer's representative they have indicated they are under no obligation to complete any construction phases after this initial phase 1. With them openly stating this, my only conclusion is that they are planning to halt construction after neighborhood A1 thus leaving Eagle with a development that is not even half complete and ECSD with land over a mile away from the nearest housing, this will also add to the cost of provided school buses. The developer should not be bailed out at the expense of the residents of Eagle.

- Soleil homeowners relied on the city's PUD approval when purchasing at Soleil Homes and accepted that a school was slated to be built adjacent to Soleil. Swapping the school parcel for high density multi-family housing will negatively affect Soleil's property values. It is unacceptable to allow this land swap solely to financially benefit a private developer at the expense of current Soleil residents.
- The proposed redesign would negatively affect the views of the mountain range which some Soleil homeowners paid a premium for. The developer has tried to indicate that this would not be the case and provided a photo with a rendering of the 3 story units sketched on. Having worked in the construction industry for 25 years, I have spoken with 3 separate architects all of whom indicated that this photo would not provide an accurate illustration of the proposed development. The reason being is that you cannot accurately scale from this photo. Therefore, the developer is either intentionally misleading the Soleil residents or has not consulted with a reasonable design team.
- Having seen the proposed sketches provided by the developer for the redesign, 8 multi-family buildings all clustered together. This type of design does not fall in line with other design guidelines in the surrounding areas. This will end up looking like some other workforce housing projects further up valley such as River Run and Kayak Crossing, not that these projects are bad as they serve a purpose to seasonal workforce and are essential to Eagle County. This is not what is needed in this area as there is not the infrastructure and public transportation to support this type of development. This type of development would be better situated closer to I-70.
- I am led to believe that the placement of the school was extensively thought through by Town of Eagle staff and the school board during the PUD process. There was an extensive traffic study regarding the school placement in an effort to avoid traffic issues currently experienced with Brush Creek Elementary. It was decided that they did not want traffic driving through a neighborhood which is what would happen with the revised plan.

Finally and just to be clear, I am not opposed to the original Haymeadow development and would actually welcome it's completion. We welcome new neighbors and the vitality it will bring to the Town. I am opposed to the land swap and all that it entails. This land swap is to purely benefit the developer financially due to their own mismanagement and subsequent financial issues. The developer's representatives do not have any construction experience and this is their first project, as a result they

have unfortunately failed to produce what was originally planned. The surrounding neighbors and the Town of Eagle should not have to suffer as a result of this.

I would like to thank you for your consideration of this important community issue and hope you will consider our opposition.

Many Thanks

Matt Owens

From: [Kristin Kenney Williams](#)
To: [Planning and zoning; clerk group](#)
Subject: R LHaymeadow support letter
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 10:53:55 AM
Attachments: [Haymeadow S P application.doc](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Thank you for your consideration,
Kristin

Kristin Kenney Williams
President, Commfluent Inc.
www.commfluent.com
kristin@commfluent.com
970-390-0062

To:

Mayor Turnipseed and Town Councilpersons Jessen, Kerst, Solomon, Palmer, Bodenheimer and Gbours

Cc:

Town of Eagle Planning & Zoning Commissioners Perkins, Holland, Hood, Webb, Gregg, Nutkins, Townsend and Winkler pz@townofeagle.org and Jenny Rakow, Town Clerk, clerk@townofeagle.org

Delivered via email

Re: Support for Haymeadow PUD amendment application

December 14, 2020

Mayor Turnipseed and Eagle Town Council,

As a longtime Eagle County resident and attainable housing advocate (I currently serve on the Eagle County Housing Task Force), please accept this letter as indication of my support for the Haymeadow PUD amendment application currently under your review.

In short, the opportunity to speed along the construction of 112 multi-family housing units at Haymeadow represents the type of forward-thinking, reimagining of previously-approved development agreements that communities in Eagle County should take very seriously in order to meet current and future housing demands. It's possible that these types of market-driven amendments should even be encouraged.

The housing market in Eagle and in Eagle County has changed substantially since Haymeadow was approved in 2014. The demand for housing and its stresses on locals have never been higher. We need attainable housing and, with that in mind, anything that speeds delivery should be considered. This is especially true if it means developing housing units that were previously vetted and approved on parcels of land that have been disturbed, or will be.

To deliver the same critical housing units in the near term the Town of Eagle would have to approve new development somewhere else. Even if that was a desirable scenario we all know development approvals often take years; meanwhile our local housing needs continue to grow.

In a meeting with the Haymeadow Development Team it was explained to me that the multifamily density proposed to be "swapped" will be made up of one- and two-bedroom units that will be attainable for singles or couples nearer to the Area Median Income (AMI) than anything currently available on the market in Eagle. In many cases these prices would allow buyers their first opportunity to own real estate and begin building equity in a home in Eagle.

In addition, the “swap” will shift the vast majority of Haymeadow’s LERP units into Phase 1, further guaranteeing that units will be even more attainable for locals seeking to buy a home in Eagle in the next few years.

Since the application does not seek to add density to the PUD there shouldn’t be any concern over additional traffic or previously unvetted impacts.

I’m also aware of the proposed cabin renovation associated with the Haymeadow amendment application. While I view its importance as secondary to the housing benefits of the amendment, renovating the cabin as an additional local economic engine is a good idea and to the benefit of Eagle and greater Eagle County Community. Again, this portion of the amendment application takes something existing at Haymeadow and reimagines it to meet a real world need in the near term. Its approval, if not encouragement, should be easy.

Smart growth has been a mantra in the Town of Eagle since long before Haymeadow – I lived in Eagle for several years and can attest to that. I can’t think of a smarter approach than taking something existing and approved and altering it to be more applicable to current and future needs. In my view that’s what the Haymeadow team has done.

I hope you will approve the Haymeadow PUD amendment application in its entirety.

Sincerely,

Kristin Kenney Williams
President, Commfluent Inc.
www.commfluent.com

Resident: 24 Gopher Road, EagleVail, CO

From: [Planning Department](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Cc: [Peyton Heitzman](#)
Subject: F : R LHay Meadows Developer Request
Date: Monday, December 21, 2020 3:02:22 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Another...

Best,

Angie Kyle

Administrative Tech II

TOWN OF EAGLE

200 Broadway, PO Box 609, Eagle CO 81631

Phone: 970-328-9655, Fax: 970-328-9656

CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:



Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

From: cathie <bobcathiej@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 11:41 AM

To: Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>; Planning Department <Planning@townofeagle.org>

Subject: EXTERNALHay Meadows Developer Request

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

We are residents of Brush Creek Village and have been made aware that the Hay Meadows Developer is asking to trade the location of the School designated property and build condos and other multifamily dwellings there instead.

We would like to voice our opposition to that. Even though it will not impact Brush Creek as much as the Soleil homes, it will have impacts on us as far as property values, noise, traffic etc.

Several years ago we looked at one of the first homes in the Soleil subdivision. Our children felt the home was too large for us at our ages and they didn't like

the roundabout closeness to Soleil. So we bought a duplex in Brush Creek Village instead. When we were looking at the Soleil home, the realtor for Soleil stressed to us and our children that there would be no noise on two sides of the project because of the recreation property and the adjacent property designated for a school some day. She used the value of the school property as a selling point as I am sure she did with all her buyers. To have that go away now that the subdivision is built out would be very harmful to those homeowners.

I would think having the School Property adjacent to the recreation property would be a real advantage to the School District also.

Having two or three story condos right behind several of the Soleil houses would be very detrimental to the property values, noise levels, views, etc. We sincerely hope the Planning Department and the Town Council will not grant this trade to the Hay Meadow Developer and stay with the plan that was originally approved.

Sincerely,

Bob and Cathie Jarnot

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Planning Department](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Cc: [Peyton Heitzman](#)
Subject: F : R LLand swap amendment P 20 01
Date: Monday, December 21, 2020 3:01:02 PM

FYi

Best,

Angie Kyle
Administrative Tech II
TOWN OF EAGLE
200 Broadway, PO Box 609, Eagle Co 81631
Phone: 970-328-9655, Fax: 970-328-9656
CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:

Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

-----Original Message-----

From: Lynne Dees <tresgatos3@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Sunday, December 20, 2020 9:05 PM
To: Planning Department <Planning@townofeagle.org>
Subject: EXTERNALLand swap amendment PUDA20-01

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Town of Eagle,

As Eagle residents at 0170 Montgomerie Circle in the Brush Creek townhomes, we want to express our concern regarding the proposed land swap amendment for the Haymeadow development to swap the building site of 340 multi-family units with the already-approved site for an elementary school and recreation area.

1. The land parcel for the school is smaller than the already-approved site for the multi-family units and we fear for crowding, noise, increased traffic and lack of parking for these residents.
2. The proposed amendment moves the school farther away from the non-Haymarket homes (Eagle Terrace and Soleil) from which children will be coming to attend school.

Instead of allowing the land-swap, could the developer perhaps go ahead with the phase that builds these residences on the original plat of land ahead of the phase to build the school? I read the developer's statement and truly understand the need for 'affordable' homes for local residents; however, only 25% of the proposed homes are deed-restricted which does not seem to make a dent in the current Eagle Valley affordable housing problem. I am not convinced that the developer's plan will help the housing issue much, so am not sure why the Town of Eagle would allow the proposed amendment to pass when it promotes crowding, increased traffic, lack of parking, increased noise, requires moving the school, and decreases the property values of many of the Soleil homes.

The original plan for Haymeadow makes more sense and seems to promote a better quality of life for Eagle residents.

Thank you,

Lynne Dees and Bill Crawford
tresgatos3@sbcglobal.net

From: [Brian Bloess](#)
To: [Lark Group](#); [Scott Turnipseed](#); [Andy Jessen](#); [Pappy Ernst](#); [Matt Solomon](#); [Adam Palmer](#); [Ilen Odenhemier](#); [David Gboury](#); [Town of Eagle.org](#); [Planning and Zoning](#)
Subject: Re: LHaymeadow Support Letter
Date: Tuesday, December 22, 2020 11:01:20 AM
Attachments: [20.12.22 Bloess HM Signed Support Letter .pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

All,

Happy Holidays! Thank you all for your commitment to our town and valley. In a past life I was heavily involved in community management and I fully understand the time constraints and sacrifices that each of you make. It's hardly enough to say thank you but I appreciate the dedication.

Please see the attached support letter for the Haymeadow PUD amendment. Feel free to reach out anytime should you have any questions.

Kindest regards,

Brian Bloess

To: Eagle Town Council

RE: Approval of Haymeadow Application

December 22, 2020

Dear Mayor Turnipseed and Eagle Town Council,

Please approve the Haymeadow PUD amendment. I'm a resident of Eagle Ranch and a local business person. Eagle's local business community needs more full time residents to support it. We also need quality places for our employees to live that complement their lifestyle and allow them to stay here in Eagle. The units that Haymeadow proposes to "swap" into this first phase of construction are already approved to be built (albeit years from now). We need housing now and moving all Haymeadow's multi-family units nearer to the Pool & Ice Rink makes more sense anyway.

Also restoring the cabin area near the Haymaker Trail will help clean up that area and make the trail experience better while providing another local economic engine.

I support the proposed Haymeadow amendments and hope you will too.

Thank you,



Brian Bloess

Order and Sort/High Country Closets

136 Eagle Ranch Road

Eagle, CO. 81631

brianbloess@gmail.com

www.orderandsort.com

From: [Planning Department](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: F : R L Oppose Haymeadow Amendment Swap
Date: Monday, December 2, 2020 10:32:44 AM

Another one...

Best,

Angie Kyle
Administrative Tech II
TOWN OF EAGLE
200 Broadway, PO Box 609, Eagle Co 81631
Phone: 970-328-9655, Fax: 970-328-9656
CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:

Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

-----Original Message-----

From: Sheryl Roalstad <sheroal@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, December 24, 2020 11:22 AM
To: Planning Department <Planning@townofeagle.org>; Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>
Cc: Pete Leibig <pete.leibig@gmail.com>
Subject: EXTERNAL Oppose Haymeadow Amendment/Swap

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear City of Eagle Planning Department,
We are residents of Brush Creek Village. Having read the detailed opposition statements from fellow Soleil neighbors, we stand in solidarity with their opposition to the Haymeadow Amendment/Swap. A lot of work and consideration, community involvement and compromise went into the development of the plan. In the end, it felt like a plan that tried to keep open space and density in balance. We remain concerned about possible traffic congestion, but resolved to remain hopeful that the City of Eagle would address this if/when it became a problem.

Requesting a change to this plan seems highly suspicious to us. Did the developer intentionally misplace his infrastructure in order to substantiate this request?

Please keep us informed of your deliberations on this matter.

Sincerely,
Sheryl Roalstad and Peter Leibig
2567 Montgomerie Circle

Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad

From: [Jenny Rakow](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: F : R LLetter o Support or Haymeadow venue
Date: Monday, December 2 , 2020 10:55:25 M
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[Ranch Manager s abin venue letter.pdf](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image00 .png](#)
[image00 .png](#)
[image00 .png](#)

Jenny Rakow, CMC

Town Clerk & Municipal Court Supervisor

TOWN OF EAGLE

200 Broadway, PO Box 609, Eagle Co 81631

Phone: 970-328-9623, Fax: 970-328-5203

CLICK BELOW FOR TOWN WEBSITE, NEWS, EVENTS OR TO PROVIDE FEEDBACK:



Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-200.1, et seq.

From: Justin Weaver <justin@eventrents.com>

Sent: Monday, December 28, 2020 10:54 AM

To: Clerk Group <clerk@townofeagle.org>; Scott Turnipseed <scott.turnipseed@townofeagle.org>; Andy Jessen <andy.jessen@townofeagle.org>; Pappy Kerst <pappy.kerst@townofeagle.org>; Matt Solomon <matt.solomon@townofeagle.org>; Adam Palmer <adam.palmer@townofeagle.org>; Ellen Bodenhemier <ellen.bodenhemier@townofeagle.org>; david.gboury@townofeagle.org

Cc: Jennifer Pletcher <jennifer@geminieventplanning.com>

Subject: EXTERNALLetter of Support for Haymeadow Venue

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good Morning,

Attached please find my letter of support for the Haymeadow venue. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Happy holidays,

Justin Weaver



Event Rents | Vail/Aspen | Physical: 315 Spring Creek Cir. Gypsum, CO 81637 Mail: P.O. Box 1709, Eagle CO 81631
Office: (970) 328-6707

Fax: (970) 328-7117

justin@eventrents.com | www.eventrents.com



Warning: This message contains confidential information and/or attachments and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute, print, or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail or phone if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain viruses. The sender therefore does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message, which arise as a result of e-mail transmission. If verification is required please request a hard-copy version.

Event Rents

Physical:
315 Spring Creek Cir
Gypsum, CO. 81637
Mailing:
PO Boix 1709
Eagle, CO 81631
970-328-6707 P
970-328-7117 F
www.eventrents.com

To: Mayor Turnipseed and Eagle Town Councilpersons
(Turnipseed, Jessen, Kerst, Solomon, Palmer, Bodenheimer, Gboursy)
RE: Haymeadow PUD Amendment Support
Delivered via email

Dear Mayor and Eagle Town Councilpersons,

I am writing to you today in regards to the reactivation of the "Ranch Manager's Cabin" in the Haymeadow Development. As the general manager of Event Rents Vail / Aspen LLC, formerly Alpine Party Rental, I am in full support of having another event venue option in Eagle. I have been in the Colorado event industry since 2005, and in that time I have watched the market grow exponentially. Even through economic down times like the 2008 recession and our current pandemic, an unchanging fact is that people love to congregate and celebrate. A constant complaint I hear from my customers is how competitive and difficult it is to book a venue in this market. Our business is located in Gypsum which will logistically make us an ideal vendor for this venue. With the success of this venue my business will grow and I will be able to employ more people that live in Eagle County.

As an Eagle resident myself, I fully support all growth in the Town of Eagle. While I greatly appreciate the tight-knit community that is Eagle, I know economically the town would thrive with more attraction to tourism. The event industry truly has a significant impact on hospitality/lodging, local retail and restaurants.

I and my team greatly appreciate your time and consideration. Please do not hesitate to contact me for any elaboration or consultation.

Thank you,
Justin Weaver
Mobile 720-480-4279
justin@eventrents.com

From: [Yvonne Schwartz](#)
To: [Allen Odenhemier](#); [Scott Urnipseed](#); [Pappy Ernst](#); [Randy Reitter](#); [Andy Jessen](#); [Matt Solomon](#); [Jenny Rakow](#); [Planning and Training](#)
Subject: R L Support of Haymeadow development
Date: Sunday, January 10, 2021 4:31:44 PM
Attachments: [Yvonne Schwartz Support 111.pdf](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please see attached letter of support

Thanks
Yvonne Schwartz

--



Yvonne Schwartz

Owner/Instructor Yoga Off Broadway

(970) 328-YOGA

www.yogaoffbroadway.com

<https://vimeo.com/ondemand/stayatomyoga>



www.yogaandbeats.com



To: Mayor Turnipseed and Eagle Town Council
(Turnipseed, Jessen, Kerst, Solomon, Palmer, Bodenheimer, Gbours)
RE: Haymeadow PUD Amendment Support

January 7, 2021

Hello Town Council and Staff,

I'm writing to express my support of the Haymeadow PUD amendment that you will vote on in the next few months. I've had conversations with representatives from the development and understand the density/school swap that is being proposed and the associated cabin renovation. Both make sense and benefit the overall community, local families and local businesses.

By allowing the density/school swap you let Haymeadow build critical quality housing (that's already approved and going to be built someday) now. That means 112 additional "households" to shop in our stores, buy gas and, hopefully, come to yoga classes:). This will contribute to the "critical mass" we in the local business community have been looking forward to for years. It will provide more citizens of Eagle to help build a good year round local economy. It will also give full time residents looking for a place to live a home. We all know people looking for housing.

As you all know, many local businesses are struggling to stay afloat with the effects the pandemic has had on their ability to do business in a profitable manner. The thought of a wedding and event venue that draws discretionary income from outside the community further allows local businesses to capture money spent here by people who visit from elsewhere. This is also an important part to a healthy local business economy.

Lastly, I want to come back to the point that the units Haymeadow wants to add into its first phase are already approved to be built. To me that means we don't need to approve a new development somewhere else to get the same amount of housing right away. I think this should be very important to the town.

The Haymeadow amendment is a win for everyone involved and I hope you will approve it. I hope to be hosting a yoga retreat at the cabin someday.

Thank you,

Yvonne Schwartz

Yoga Off Broadway

To: Town of Eagle Planning & Zoning Commission and Town Council

Cc: Jenny Rakow, Town Clerk, clerk@townofeagle.org

Re: Support for Haymeadow PUD amendment application

Delivered via email

January 11, 2021

Dear Town of Eagle Planning & Zoning Commission and Town Council,

As you know, the Eagle County Housing Task Force's mission includes supporting responsible development of housing units in our community. Mission in mind, we are writing to show our support of the Haymeadow PUD amendment currently being considered.

Members of the Haymeadow development team presented their proposed amendments to the existing Haymeadow PUD to our group at our December 4, 2020 task force meeting.

The proposed school site/multifamily density swap presents a unique opportunity for the Town of Eagle and our greater community. The successful swap will allow 112 additional units of already-approved multifamily density to be built in the initial construction phase of the project. Otherwise, the same approved and critically-needed multifamily housing units will not be delivered for more than a decade. As you know our community needs housing units now and the proposed density/school swap serves that need without consuming more land, adding new density or unvetted traffic impacts to the Town of Eagle.

In the instance of the proposed swap, it was obvious that the Haymeadow team studied and considered the economic and workforce housing reports conducted locally in recent years. They have identified a need in our community and seek to address it in a manner that benefits multiple parties by reimagining their existing PUD to address current needs. For example, not only will the Eagle County School District receive a larger parcel, but they will also receive five additional deed-restricted units specifically for ECSD employees. This comes in addition to expediting the delivery of the vast majority of the project's LERP units into Phase 1. Again, this makes housing more attainable and available to those who need it in the near term. We also understand that the Haymeadow team has been communicating with the School District to ensure their needs are addressed with this swap.

Community outreach efforts by the developer are also extensive with feedback evident in parts of the Haymeadow application such as the incorporation of a 300' buffer and landscaped berm offered in consideration of adjacent neighbors. Building orientation is also respectful of neighbors' existing view corridors.

While outside the general purview of our group, the reactivation of the former Ranch Manager's Cabin as a wedding and event's venue makes sense as a local economic engine.

Please accept this letter as indication of the Eagle County Housing Task Force's support for the Haymeadow PUD amendment currently under your review. This is a fast-track, low-impact solution to providing entry level housing available to locals.

Sincerely,

The Eagle County Housing Task Force

From: [Martin Vandeven](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: R LHaymeadow P emendment 2020
Date: Thursday, January 2, 2021 1:11:40 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please provide these concerns to the Planning and Zoning Board.

Moving the school to Neighborhood C creates issues that the amendment to the PDU does not address:

1. Area C is very low-lying ground. A tremendous amount of fill will be required to provide a stable base for a school to be built on. This will be a significant increase in construction cost to the school district.
2. It is assumed that the school will be attended by students from the Meadows as well as from Eagle Ranch. At the previous school location, Sylvan Lake would be used by students from Eagle Ranch, that traffic will now travel east on Brush Creek Rd causing more traffic on a narrow two-lane road. Another avenue to the school in Neighborhood C by students living in Eagle Ranch is Eagle Ranch Rd. to Ouzel Lane. The traffic routing changes are not adequately addressed or accommodated by the changes to the Meadows PDU.
3. Truly Eagle has become the "bedroom community" for workers serving the ski industry. Many residents of Eagle Ranch do not agree with the high-density housing community in the Meadows. At the time of construction of our home in Eagle Ranch, we were told the Meadows would be ranches of approximately five acres.
4. We will now say "goodbye" to the hundreds of elk that used the Meadows during the winter. Little acknowledgement of that and certainly no accommodation for that.

It is very disturbing.

Martin Vandeven

From: barb_reburblc.com
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Cc: [Mike Claymon](#); [Lizzy Owens](#); [Matt Owens](#); [gina anhekk@gmail.com](#); [Michael leinman](#); [akbuising@gmail.com](#); [Linda ennett](#); [kbradley.sli@er.net](#); barb_reburblc.com
Subject: Re: Haymeadow PUD amendment
Date: Tuesday, February 2, 2021 12:43:54 PM
Attachments: [Outlook_d_bur4.png](#)
[Outlook_13pddrut.png](#)
[Outlook_c1m_z14s.png](#)
[Outlook_25a_2h05.png](#)
[Outlook_s_syib.png](#)
[Outlook_bpkp_d1.png](#)
[Outlook_ho5b5_ca.png](#)
[Outlook_rr2u4ahy.png](#)
[Outlook_11tp_thu.png](#)
[Outlook_3d_5isy.png](#)
[Outlook_r_d2a5c.png](#)
[Outlook_4ygc_hlu.png](#)
[Outlook_smpc_02r.png](#)
[Outlook_po05lbm.png](#)
[Outlook_5w5_2m.png](#)
[Outlook_usd2zul4.png](#)
[Outlook_1uy_ino.png](#)
[Outlook_cnc5wg_e.png](#)
[Outlook_shp00ipg.png](#)
[Outlook_wpoeklci.png](#)
[Response to Haymeadow PUD amendment 2020.doc](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Jessica-
Thank you for your updates.

With these upcoming dates in mind([March 2: P&Z Commission hearing](#)/[March 23: Town Council hearing](#)), in addition to the informal petition signatures submitted and others independently reaching out to voice their opinions, please see a response to the 'Haymeadow PUD Amendment 2020' submittal.

Can you distribute accordingly, or would you like me to send a group email to P/Z and Town Council? Also, would a distribution include any ECS Administrators?

Completely understand that this is such a difficult time.

Please take care,
Barb

From: Jessica Lake <jessica.lake@townofeagle.org>
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 8:58 AM
To: Mike Claymon <mikeclaymon@hotmail.com>; barb@reburblc.com <barb@reburblc.com>
Subject: RE: Haymeadow PUD amendment

Yes, that's correct.

□

Jessica Lake

Response to Haymeadow P amendment 2020 brika Properties de veloper

he introduction statements by Haymeadow de veloper stating:

we were reminded o the town s desire to cluster density nearer the town core and to maintain the country lane eel o rush reek Road. ntroduction Page 5

One might consider the contrary, that mo ing the school site urther out rush reek Road R creates less o a country lane eel and more chopped up planning with less cohesi eness or synergy within the own and connected recreational educational acilities and trails. his would produce the opposite o an e icient land use pattern or these acilities.

Iso, such a cluster o multi amily MF housing units and school relocation urther down R, creates more o a tra ic congestion and transportation in rastructure issue that hasn t been addressed thoroughly with regards to school swap, ire department, emergency issues, increase o tra ic at Ouzel and R intersection, manager s cabin e ent tra ic, or other continued increases in recreational or residential tra ic rom locals and out o town guests to places like Syl an Lake, Frost reek, rush reek Open Spaces recreation o rush reek area and other homesteads.

ased on the tra ic Memorandum dated, October 1 , 2020, R : Haymeadow School Site Swap tra ic Memo, agle, olorado to randon ohen, brika Properties, rom ari J. Schroeder, P , P O , submitted with the current Haymeadow P amendment 2020, the conclusion is also an increase in tra ic i swap is appro ed and that urther studies are needed prior to Final Plat or the Ouzel and R intersection. his memo ocused on school tra ic patterns rom the appro ed location to the proposed and actually does not take into account other actors listed abo e or below. dditionally, this memo re erenced tra ic and trip generation impacts that are based on the original studies done by Fo uttle ransportation roup, LL , on ugust 15, 2013, almost years ago.

One e ample o growth since this original 2013 tra ic study took place is Frost reek. n 2013, there were 32 members and today there are 350. he dwelling units ha e increased rom to an appro ed 13 units. hat increase in growth and associated tra ic outside o school related tra ic has not been taken into account to properly usti y a proposed swap o school to be located right o R.

nother uestion comes into play as well with a proposed ire department and a school ne t to each other on the same street. uoting the de veloper, *the new school site would be located right across the street rom the Haymeadow ire station.* o create a literal sense o the uestion, what i while school is starting ending with a line o cars in carpool waiting or their children to be dismissed, the ire department is dispatched with an emergency How does that work or doesn t it hat are the sa ety measures that would be in place and implemented with these two buildings within such close pro imity to each other oes this create a delay in emergency response More importantly, does this put students, sta , and parents in harm s way when an emergency response is needed, creating a sa ety hazard and dangerous situation

e veloper continues: *Other documents that we re iewed in our preparation were recently commissioned housing and economic reports speci ic to agle ounty. hese studies illustrate the acute*

need and demand for quality workforce housing for locals who already live here, but struggle to find housing in a market desperately short of units.” Introduction Page 5

denial of developer's request for a land swap **does not** mean Haymeadow workforce housing at all. Rather, it is a location issue only.

Keeping the approved Plan as is also allows the CO to focus on population growth, transportation issues, and congestion in a more gradual sense following with the currently approved Haymeadow buildout neighborhoods 1, instead of Haymeadow's newly proposed plan to rapidly build ALL MF units on smaller acreage all at once.

With the own growth rate of 1.5% per year and projections for the Eagle County population to reach 3,000 by 2040, based on data from the latest Eagle Comprehensive Plan, the traffic issues continue to be a white elephant in the room. This does not take into account the undermentioned developments in process. Current affordable approved housing plans indicate that between Alon Flats, Hockett Gulch, Eagle Landing, West Eagle Real Housing Project and Haymeadow named developments, there are multiple affordable housing units coming to market and others potentially in the future. One might also consider with the rapidly changing landscape due to CO and home office living at an all time high, families people leaving metropolitan areas in droves, that the current and future demographic and housing types may have changed as well. Data for this drastic change of lifestyle from commuting to telecommuting has not been taken into account. With this and the aforementioned approved housing developments, another perspective might be that with the proposed amendment of Haymeadow to quickly and immediately build all MF units now in one concentrated area, this creates a pendulum effect of same type units flooding the market when demand may be shifting.

Developer indicates: *“In conversations with Eagle County School District confirmed no immediate need for an additional school in Phase 1 of Haymeadow.” Introduction Page 5*

It would be preferred for SCO to affirm that statement, not a developer proposing a parcel swap which greatly financially benefits them. In addition, whether SCO has an immediate need for a school or not, does not preclude developer from building their current approved 1 neighborhood.

Developer introduces another component separate and unrelated to this land swap proposal: *“Our planning also reinvested early conversations surrounding the future of the original ranch manager's cabin headquarters. As part of our proposal, we include a plan to redesign and activate the cabin area to the benefit of the community and as an economic engine for Eagle's businesses.” Introduction Page 5*

The manager's cabin would be located approximately 1 miles into the Haymeadow property. This is being touted as a viable economic engine. State what studies were done to prove any economic viability. This cabin has no connection to the requested swap, however, seemingly appears to be a marketing incentive for a swap. Is Haymeadow planning to re-locate the cabin either way? There are currently no utilities or construction in the area of the manager's cabin. When would this relocation actually take place and with what future phase of construction? How will this affect surrounding neighbors human animals with regards to traffic, noise, and other activities causing disruptions? Also, would the cabin be the CO responsibility to maintain and provide upkeep ongoing, and at what cost, in actuality then the financial responsibility of the Eagle taxpayers?

Developer states: *“The Haymeadow Plan was approved by CO Ordinance 11, Series of 2014 after several years of Plan concept planning and Plan revision. 1.0 Description of Proposed Project Page 5*

The concept of time and effort that went into choosing the school site should be a reason to keep the school site as currently approved. Not, it creates a conflict with the latest Eagle Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 4.1.010 in the current approved Plan, that various land use elements are designed so

that they inter relate cohesively with each other. The boundary between the P and adjacent land areas was taken into consideration to follow the requirements with particular attention to ensure that land use patterns were compatible with the school site and adjacent recreational and future master planned recreational facilities.

1.1 School site amendment

Haymeadow developer would like to swap a 14.22 acre parcel and merge it with neighborhood 1, which is 41. acres. This would create a 55. 2 acre parcel or 340 units of MF housing. In this proposed amendment, all 112 units of MF housing from neighborhoods and would shift from a combined total of a 10 .1 acre site with SF duplexes, to a much more congested scenario on a much smaller parcel of land with MF units only. This creates a situation with potentially double or more than that in vehicle traffic by using 2 vehicles per household in a much smaller concentrated area. The average comprehensive Plan provides data of 2. people per household so the vehicle count could potentially be higher.

O : The developer released a plan drawing to Soleil residents indicating the existence of 24 unit buildings on the proposed swap land, exceeding the 35 ft height restriction with roof lines, including only 20 covered parking spots per building and what appears to be an additional 1 street spots per building. Doing the math, that is only 3 spots per building and with a 2 car per household number, the more realistic number is 4 total cars per building. It appears that Haymeadow short sided 12 cars per unit for parking vehicles. Aesthetically that scenario alone could be viewed as congestion and surely not enough parking to accommodate real life living conditions. Certainly, this does not fall within the visions of what Haymeadow refers to for the O's country lane feel.

Additionally, citing Haymeadow's P nne ation and development agreement Resolution 12 regarding L RP Local Employee Residency Program, Haymeadow's original approval per own guidelines encompassed their statement, *"the L RP units shall be dispersed in a reasonable manner throughout each neighborhood. There may be more than one L RP unit per building, and there may be multi family buildings that contain three or more L RP units. However, all, or a significant concentration of, the required L RP units for each neighborhood shall not be located within one multi family project or cluster of buildings."* Haymeadow P nne ation and development agreement Resolution 12 L RP

This statement by Haymeadow directly contradicts their new submittal proposing an amendment to the school land use, by instead requesting to build ALL the MF units L RP in one cluster of same type units in neighborhood .

O : Haymeadow amendment page states 340 proposed units in 1 neighborhood chart. This conflicts with the Haymeadow Proposed nit ount map page , detailing 30 total units in 1 neighborhood.

O : This proposed amendment states that an 1 .3 acre portion of neighborhood would be re classified as school use. However, the Haymeadow Land se Summary current nit ount and Proposed nit ount map page , details in that acreage would all from 4 .1 to 32.1. Understanding correctly reading this proposed amendment, that is only a differential of 15 acres. So, the proposed school land swap would actually only amount to less than an acre or . to the school

In a letter dated December 10, 2020, sent by Sandra Mutchler, FO foragle County Schools to the O , it states, *"While both the existing and proposed school dedications are viable school sites, the proposed site is preferred due primarily to its size and location."*

Acreage size is actually only a . differential and the new location may pose questions related to potential safety dangers with emergency response issues, not to mention an adjacent busier road with posted higher speed limits 40 , would the school entertain their original location as best suited for the school and synergy of activities Please also refer to Mountain Recreation letter submitted December 3,

2020 by Board President, Elizabeth Jones and Board Member, Tom Pohl, which does not allow a land swap.

Or are the School administrators focusing on the Haymeadow developer Brika proposing to isolate the 5 housing units for sale only for School employees. School doesn't own these units, how can Brika only offer to School employees and not allow others in need of housing from potentially buying those units that or who gives the developer the right or the legal authority to decide who buys and lives in this housing. Additionally, regarding the extension of road and utility improvements to the proposed school site, when would that take place and if a school may not be built for multiple years, how would that financially binding scenario be taken into consideration present day and Brika even offer these incentives for School administrators approval of a swap.

Haymeadow notes 24 of MF units will be designated as deed restricted. This 24 seems like a misleading figure, as the 3 units of 344 all MF units is actually the 10 requirement for the entire development of 3. Conversely, Hockett Ulrich's website states 45 of their 3 rental units will be deed restricted with no income restrictions.

Developer states: *the current level of extreme housing demand or entry level and attainable units was not foreseen in the planning stages that took place prior to the 2014 approval. 1.1 School Site Amendment Page*

However, based on the Eagle Creek Community Plan, referenced numerous times in this developer proposed amendment, the demand for entry level and attainable units has been stressed since 2010 and prior. Therefore, Haymeadow developer should have known and had all the available information at their disposal to make that decision in 2014.

Developer states: *the result is no increase in density from the overall approved Plan. The overall approval will remain at 3 dwelling units with the same breakdown of 344 multi-family units and 43 single family duplex units. 1.1 School Site Amendment Page*

This statement is misleading in that the Plan density locationally would extremely change from the approved plan, making the front portion of the development exceptionally overcrowded and cramped if the school land swap is approved. Keeping the school land as is allows for ample and shared parking for events, creates less congestion with vehicles on street side parking around Mountain Rec area and Sylva Lake Road parallel to Rush Creek Village, and keeps the original decisions to incorporate all activities with the school as approved. This may also become a source of income to the town for paid event parking, including for out of town guest parking in the school lot when utilizing our Eagle outdoor amenities trails and attending organized events around the Mountain Rec area. Based on the Plan, a discussion question was posed regarding how to reap more financial benefit from visitors to our community, this may create that option.

Objection: Haymeadow amendment page states 340 proposed units in 1 neighborhood chart. This conflicts with the Haymeadow Proposed Unit Count map page, detailing 30 total units in 1 neighborhood. This is an increase in density if we are to follow Haymeadow developer's Proposed Unit Count map of page.

Under the Ordinance amendments to Planning and Development Plans, conditions of amendment, this proposed amendment application does affect in a substantially adverse manner either the enjoyment of land abutting upon, adjoining or across a street from the planned unit development or the public interest, and therefore should not be approved. In this case, neighboring housing developments are adversely affected and through informal petitions signed and submitted to the Board, have voiced their community support or opposition to any proposed amendment of a school land swap. In addition, Mountain Recreation representatives have outlined in a letter dated December 3, 2020, their multiple

reasons why an approval of a land swap would adversely affect Mountain Recreation services and residents of the CO in general. They have referenced the conditions of amendment as well.

The developer admits: *Recognizing that this is a change in use that could be viewed as potentially impactful to the adjacent Soleil neighborhood Haymeadow is willing to commit to a 300 foot vertical building setback from the Soleil boundary and to landscape within that setback area in a manner that will create a strong buffer area between the two residential uses.* 1.1.2 tract neighborhood , detailed description Page 10

In the statement above, the developer points out in their proposed amendment application that the Haymeadow amendment does a lot in a substantially adverse manner, the residents of Soleil. In what appears to be a diversion from compliance, Haymeadow attempts to mask the situation with landscape suggestions that are not acceptable. The homeowners of Soleil have overwhelmingly and collectively voiced their opposition to this proposed amendment to swap school land with a MF unit development; additionally, the noncompliance per section 4.11.050 2 still exists.

The developer indicates: *the approved PUD development Plan would be amended to enlarge the existing neighborhood 1 area to include the 14.2 acres of tract and the 14.2 acres would be designated for multi-family construction. The existing multi-family density of 112 units that is currently approved for neighborhoods would be transferred to neighborhood 1. Neighborhood 1 is the closest neighborhood to the community core and at 41.1 acres is currently approved for 14 multi-family units and 2 single-family duplex units. In accordance with the objectives of the single-family community Plan neighborhood 1 is the highest density neighborhood at 5.4 units per acre. The addition of 14.2 acres and 112 units would shift neighborhood 1 slightly higher to a density of units per acre.* 1.1.2 tract neighborhood , detailed description Page 10 11

Based on the CO amendments to PUD zoning and development Plans, conditions of amendment, section 4.11.050 3, this proposed amendment confers a special benefit upon the developer, demonstrating a conflict with the proposed modification to swap the school land. In hindsight and maybe a glaring lack of planning, the developer now proposes this condensed housing scenario in an effort to reduce or recoup costs at tremendous expense to surrounding neighborhoods. As stated, prior, the developer had access to all data and information regarding the housing needs of the CO. His proposed amendment not getting approved, does not prohibit the developer from building the currently approved PUD, which provides a better distribution of the PUD zone districts throughout the development, ultimately one of the reasons for the initial PUD approval. Refer also to the aforementioned Haymeadow's PUD annexation and development agreement Resolution 12 regarding LRP Local Employee Residency Program.

The developer suggests: *We anticipate this manager's cabin creating a multi-million dollar economic opportunity for local businesses.* For 1.2 abin Special ents enue page 11

This statement is based on what data collected or proof that this will be a viable entity for local businesses or the CO, especially the single residents who provide the tax base to run and maintain such an entity. Has the developer actually provided a cost analysis to the CO for expenses associated with this cabin both short and long term: maintenance, insurance, liability coverage, water/septic system maintenance, employee costs, parking costs, shuttle costs, etc. With that in mind, would the CO require an approval from the residents to acquire the cabin? Please also refer to manager's cabin remarks in the introduction section above.

The developer attempts to mollify by adding: *Haymeadow does not anticipate any extension of Field Street through the Soleil neighborhood into Haymeadow.* Access and traffic page 1

What does not anticipate mean in developer terminology Please clarify based on the proposed plans. This should be a definite statement.

Please also refer to Mountain Recreation letter submitted December 3, 2020 by Board President, Elizabeth Jones and Board Member, Tom Pohl, referencing their concerns about any potential tension on Field Street. "The applicant has had an early conversation with representatives of the greater Eagle Fire Protection District. At this time there are no identified negative impacts associated with the shift in location of the school and multi-family uses. The new school site would be located right across the street from the Haymeadow fire station." "The cabin will continue to be accessed via the existing driveway from Rush Creek Road. This driveway will be improved and widened to a year-round gravel surface with pull-off lanes. The increase in traffic on Rush Creek Road will be minimal compared to the background traffic levels given the intent to have large events shuttled to the site. For 2.0 Access and Traffic, Emergency Services page 1

It is preferred that the greater Eagle Fire Protection District voice whether any negative impacts can and will be identified with potentially moving the school land, rather than a developer who would benefit from a swap stating, at this time none exist.

Regarding the proposed school swap to neighborhood, for students and staff members and especially as a parent, the red flag is being raised about safety issues. Having a fire department directly across the street that would potentially have emergency dispatch situations simultaneously occurring during a congested drop-off or pick-up with carpool lines, parents, staff, and students in close proximity or blocking thoroughways, doesn't sound as though no negative impacts exist with a shift in school location. Additionally, students 5th grade that may ride their bikes to school create further trepidations or safety when firetrucks may be racing to an emergency while conceivably having to dodge children at the same time. There is a higher speed limit 40 on R and stop signs that would be placed at the entrance to R. If this would cause additional backups to R access and congestion on a street that hypothetically would house the school and the fire department. One might conclude that all of this certainly seems to lend itself to negative impacts.

Due to the emergency concerns and potential negative impacts for the land swap of school to neighborhood, it is important to reiterate what might occur if the developer is allowed to proceed with a swap. This creates a snowballing effect with R access: increased traffic and congestion mentioned above, noise pollution related to manager's cabin events, safety issues with the close proximity of a fire department to a school, higher posted speeds of 40 on R and current flow of traffic going to and from Sylva Lake, Frost Creek, trails, ranches, homesteads and soon from Ouzel once connected. Has the developer or O actively reached out to Ragle Ranch residents especially near Ouzel, letting them know of this proposal? With all of this in mind, we feel the current proposed school location actually emulates the country land feel better in its setting, safety with traffic speeds, and less congestion.

Finally, in response to this proposed Haymeadow P amendment 2020, as residents of Soleil and surrounding neighborhoods, please take these statements and responses to this proposal into serious consideration as to why this swap of land should not happen. Notwithstanding our stated concerns, questions, and objections to the proposed school swap, we reserve the right to consult with counsel to determine if legal action is necessary to protect our interests.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

For Soleil and surrounding neighborhood residents and neighbors.

From: [Brian Bishop](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Haymeadow Swap
Date: Friday, February 12, 2021 12:15 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To whom it may concern,

I want to voice my opposition to the Hay Meadow Land swap. I have lived in the Gore and Eagle Valleys for the better part of 50 years. I have lived in Brush Creek Village since 2010 and have observed the ridiculous amount of increased traffic that has come with the Development in this area.

I have been opposed to the entire Haymeadow project from the beginning due to that lack of infrastructure. The roads in and out of this area are already over crowded. However, as the current land use was adopted, there isn't much that we can do about that now. The impact on our neighborhoods will be absolutely negative. Our property values will decrease as well as the small town feel of this area.

Please deny this swap... Eagle doesn't need this at all.

Regards,

Brian Bishop
1442 Montgomerie Circle

From: [olleen_auron](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Hay meadow swap
Date: Friday, February 12, 2021 1:01:4 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Greetings Jessica,

I understand there is a P&Z meeting on March 2 re the Haymeadow PUD land swap I have written previously to strongly oppose this swap. I do not at this point have much respect for the developer and his/their disregard for the existing approved plans and concerns by nearby neighbors.

To reiterate what others have eloquently stated my opposition is based on all of the items below:

- 1) Surrounding homeowners bought homes based on the advantages of the current school location
- 2) Negatively impacts surrounding homeowners due to reduced property values and blocked mountain views
- 3) Disregards the extensive process by TOE and ECSD during the PUD process to determine the best school location
- 4) Consequences of the inadequate planning and budget mismanagement should be the burden of the developer and not surrounding homeowners
- 5) Affects surrounding homeowners in a substantially adverse manner and should be denied per TOE Code Section 4.11.050
- 6) Results in a chopped up development
- 7) Reduces opportunities for shared facilities between the school and Mountain Recreation
- 8) Shared parking between Mountain Recreation and the school is eliminated
- 9) Traffic patterns will be negatively impacted by the proposed school location
- 10) A potentially dangerous and unsafe situation would be created with the new location of the school being adjacent to the Haymeadow fire station
- 11) Clustering multi-family units in a small area results in traffic and parking problems
- 12) The "country lane feel" of Brush Creek Road is negatively impacted
- 13) Eagle Pool and Ice Rink expansion plans are already in progress using the current school location
- 14) Mountain Recreation is strongly opposed to the school land swap PUD amendment
- 15) If this proposal is denied, the developer can still build Haymeadow according to the existing PUD
- 16) If this proposal is denied, affordable housing options can still be provided according to the existing PUD
- 17) The proposed school location only benefits the developer by allowing deferral of some

infrastructure costs

18) Keeping the school in its current location is just common sense which is why that location was chosen originally

Kind regards

Colleen Gauron

2023 Montgomerie circle

Eagle, 81631

From: [Bart Harst](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Haymeadow land swap
Date: Friday, February 2, 2024 10:26:24 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

As residents of Brush Creek Village, we strongly oppose the land swap proposed by the Haymeadow developer. The negative effects on traffic patterns alone is concerning. Additionally, the original well thought out plan of combining proximity of current and future recreational facilities and a school is more in keeping with the spirit of the town of Eagle. Please do not approve this change which appears to solely benefit the developer and not the neighborhood or town.

Respectfully,
Bart and Linda Harst
1632 Montgomerie Circle

Sent from my iPad

From: [Peter Leibig](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Opposed to Heymeadow Swap
Date: Friday, February 12, 2021 4:02:3 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am opposed to the Haymeadow swap for the following reasons:

- The swap negatively impacts surrounding homeowners due to reduced property values and blocked mountain views
- The swap disregards the extensive process by TOE and ECSD during the PUD process to determine the best school location
- Consequences of the inadequate planning and budget mismanagement should be the burden of the developer and not surrounding homeowners
- Reduces opportunities for shared facilities between the school and Mountain Recreation
- Shared parking between Mountain Recreation and the school is eliminated
- Traffic patterns will be negatively impacted by the proposed school location
- A potentially dangerous and unsafe situation would be created with the new location of the school being adjacent to the Haymeadow fire station
- Clustering multi-family units in a small area results in traffic and parking problem
- Eagle Pool and Ice Rink expansion plans are already in progress using the current school location
- If this proposal is denied, the developer can still build Haymeadow according to the existing PUD
- If this proposal is denied, affordable housing options can still be provided according to the existing PUD
- The proposed school location only benefits the developer, NOT the community, by allowing deferral of some infrastructure costs
- Keeping the school in its current location is just common sense which is why that location was chosen originally

Peter Leibig
2567 Montgomerie Cir
Eagle, Co 81631
pete.leibig@gmail.com
303-931-4118

From: [James . . an Hekken](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: HeyMesdow Swap
Date: Friday, February 12, 2021 3:03:42 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hey Jessica,

I know you're getting a ton of these. My apologies in bothering you with another, but it's a super important issue for those of us who live directly beside the area involved in the swap.

I very much oppose it, and the following list gives reasons why.

- 1) Surrounding homeowners bought homes based on the advantages of the current school location
- 2) Negatively impacts surrounding homeowners due to reduced property values and blocked mountain views
- 3) Disregards the extensive process by TOE and ECSD during the PUD process to determine the best school location
- 4) Consequences of the inadequate planning and budget mismanagement should be the burden of the developer and not surrounding homeowners
- 5) Affects surrounding homeowners in a substantially adverse manner and should be denied per TOE Code Section 4.11.050
- 6) Results in a chopped up development
- 7) Reduces opportunities for shared facilities between the school and Mountain Recreation
- 8) Shared parking between Mountain Recreation and the school is eliminated
- 9) Traffic patterns will be negatively impacted by the proposed school location
- 10) A potentially dangerous and unsafe situation would be created with the new location of the school being adjacent to the Haymeadow fire station
- 11) Clustering multi-family units in a small area results in traffic and parking problems
- 12) The "country lane feel" of Brush Creek Road is negatively impacted
- 13) Eagle Pool and Ice Rink expansion plans are already in progress using the current school location
- 14) Mountain Recreation is strongly opposed to the school land swap PUD amendment
- 15) If this proposal is denied, the developer can still build Haymeadow according to the existing PUD
- 16) If this proposal is denied, affordable housing options can still be provided according to the existing PUD
- 17) The proposed school location only benefits the developer by allowing deferral of some infrastructure costs
- 18) Keeping the school in its current location is just common sense which is why that location was chosen originally

Thanks for your consideration.

Thanks,

| JC Van Hekken



la
c e Co

p: 970.748.3064

a: 216 Main St Suite #209
Edwards, CO 81632

w: www.mitchandco.com e: jc@mitchandco.com

The content of this email is confidential and intended for the recipient specified in message only. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party, without a written consent of the sender. If you received this message by mistake, please reply to this message and follow with its deletion, so that we can ensure such a mistake does not occur in the future.

□

From: [Peter Amico](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: From Peter Amico strongly OPPOS the swap.
Date: Saturday, February 13, 2021 1:5 :0 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Jessica,

My reasons all center around the 18 reasons given to reject the proposal.

Thank you, Peter
720.431.8445
Brush Creek Village

From: [a e Linda erdes](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Haymeadow Swap
Date: Saturday, February 13, 2021 12:10:34 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Town of Eagle:

We are very much opposed to the proposed land exchange involving the land set-aside for the school in the Haymeadow development.

The developer has shown little care with planning this development and communicating with the community.

1. What neighboring landowners did the developer meet with to explain why this was necessary prior to dropping this on the City Council agenda? Apparently no one.
2. What development plans and progress reports have been shared with the community? At the time of this writing, the last update on the Haymeadow.com website was May 4, 2020, and it doesn't say much. They could be much more transparent by sharing more information, but they are working in their own little world. For example... what was accomplished in the previous month, and what is planned for the next month. Surely they would know. But, maybe they don't have a plan?
3. Repeated emails to the Haymeadow folks asking for status updates have failed.

This appears to be a classic bait switch operation or it wasn't planned.

1. If it was well-planned, it would have been in the initial plans.
2. Providing space for a school in the original proposed location was attractive to the community and adjacent property owners, and the proposal was approved. Now, the developer wants to switch to another plan? We have heard no good reason!
3. And, as noted previously, this developer does a very poor job of communicating with the community. What will be the next switch?

The potential school in the original proposed location has been an attractive draw for the housing developments adjacent to the Haymeadow development.

1. New homeowners in these developments knew about the land set-aside for the school. There was no asterisk saying it would probably be something else.
2. Haymeadow residences are not yet built. Those homeowners will not be affected by the same type of "plan changes" that existing neighboring homeowners are being pushed into.
3. Is it true, too, that the proposed land exchange gives the school a smaller property, and the developer something larger? If true, Hmm!

4. Will the original land set-aside for the school, very near the swimming pool, ice rink, and trail help the developer sell the apartments/homes a little easier than being by a busy road and fire station?
5. What then, would be the better school location for the existing neighbors and the school district?

We are not opposed to the Haymeadow development as originally approved. There doesn't appear to be a good reason for the community to make changes to that original plan.

Thank you for listening!

Linda & Dave Gerdes

2171 Montgomerie Circle, Eagle

From: [Michael Leinman](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#); [Michael Leinman](#)
Subject: Haymeadow Land Swap
Date: Saturday, February 13, 2021 10:34:53 AM
Attachment: [Haymeadow objection.PDF](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Jessica,

Please find my letter in opposition to the Haymeadow land swap proposed by Abrika Properties

I would like to be included in the public meetings via xoom on the scheduled dates in March of 2021

Michael J. Kleinman Esq.

C/O Law Offices of Michael L. Poindexter

2132 Montane Dr. E.

Golden, Colorado 80401

Telephone: 970-328-3986

Facsimile: (303) 526-1981

Alternate Email: Kleinmanlaw@q.com • Cellular Phone 303.359.1825

THE FOREGOING IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION, DIRECTED ONLY TO THE ADDRESSEE. IF YOU HAVE ERRONEOUSLY RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION, PLEASE DELETE THIS E-MAIL AND ALL ATTACHMENTS AND NOTIFY THE SENDER IMMEDIATELY. THE UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE OR USE OF ANY INFORMATION CONTAINED HEREIN OR IN ANY ATTACHMENTS IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED BY SECTION 7-74-102 ET SEQ. OF THE COLORADO REVISED STATUTES.

MICHAEL J. KLEINMAN

98 SOLEIL CIRCLE

EAGLE CO 81631

February 12, 2021

To: The City of Eagle City Counsel and all interested offices and officers

**LIST OF REASONS FOR OPPOSITION TO LAND SWAP AMENDMENT TO
HAYMEADOW PUD MICHAEL AND DORON KLEINMAN 98 SOLEIL
CIRCLE EAGLE, COLORADO 81631**

1. Homeowner relied on PUD approved by City which included elementary school at some time in the future adjacent to Soleil Homes subdivision when the home was purchased.
2. Developer asked for the land distribution approved and planned accordingly. Now, because they do not want to pay for development costs upfront that they knew were required to build the high-density, they propose a land swap that only benefits them and no one else.
3. The Rec district was counting on sharing playing fields with the school which will not happen if the land swap happens. The sharing of the recreation facilities just makes sense as a taxpayer.
4. The developers claim that lower cost housing will assist teachers is without merit as there is no school needed at present and if it is needed, they have land they can build upon.
5. The developers work on the road has been dismal at best with delays, mistakes, and an attempt to have Soleil Homes pay for work they agreed to perform. What makes you think they can do any better adjacent to the Soleil Subdivision.
6. Traffic will funnel off the road in front of the Soleil Subdivision as the quick way to the proposed project.
7. There is no economic benefit to the City, Recreation District or Soleil Homes to the swap. The only entity that benefits is the developer that admits that it will save millions of dollars of infrastructure costs now and use profits (if that every occurred) to pay for improvements later.
8. Every homeowner relied on the City's PUD approval and there is no good reason to change it to monetarily benefit a private developer who knew at the time of their original submittal that the high-density homes would be as approved. 1
9. The land swap would lead to rapid growth and significantly increase traffic on Brush Creek Road and Capitol Street. Neither being not able to accommodate it without the planned study and additional road improvements that would be very disruptive to the local community.


10. The unsightly and untimeliness of the construction practices of the developer of the road and their disruption of the neighborhood leads me to believe that they are incapable of developing this project in a timely and non-disruptive manner.
11. Due to the original traffic studies done with the PUD approval, the placement of the school was extensively thought through at that time and should not change.

We have also signed the petition and letters from a group of the Soleil Homeowners you have already received. We support all the reasons in that petition and filing.

I believe that if you question the developer, you will learn that their pro forma is upside down having spent considerably more on the road that was forecast, and by building the high-density condos on the proposed the land swap would assist them in recovering their losses by using the existing infrastructure in place. This request appears to be for financial reasons and nothing else.

I am attaching the homeowners list of reasons in opposition as well.,

Very Truly Yours



Michael J. Kleinman

Response to 'Haymeadow PUD Amendment 2020' (Abrika Properties-developer)

The Introduction statements by Haymeadow developer stating:

-“we were reminded of the town’s desire to cluster density nearer the town core and to maintain the “country lane feel” of Brush Creek Road.” (Introduction-Page 5)

One might consider the contrary, that moving the school site further out Brush Creek Road (BCR) creates less of a “country lane feel” and more chopped up planning with less cohesiveness or synergy within the Town and connected recreational/educational facilities and trails. This would produce the opposite of an efficient land use pattern for these facilities.

Also, such a cluster of multi-family(MF) housing units and school relocation further down BCR, creates more of a traffic congestion and transportation infrastructure issue that hasn’t been addressed thoroughly with regards to school swap, fire department, emergency issues, increase of traffic at Ouzel and BCR intersection, manager’s cabin event traffic, or other continued increases in recreational or residential traffic (from locals and out of town guests) to places like Sylvan Lake, Frost Creek, Brush Creek Open Spaces/recreation off Brush Creek area and other homesteads.

Based on the “Traffic Memorandum” dated, October 16, 2020, RE: Haymeadow School Site Swap-Traffic Memo, Eagle, Colorado to Brandon Cohen, Abrika Properties, from Kari J. Schroeder, PE, PTOE, submitted with the current Haymeadow PUD Amendment 2020, the conclusion is also an increase in traffic if swap is approved and that further studies are needed prior to Final Plat for the Ouzel and BCR intersection. This memo focused on school traffic patterns from the approved location to the proposed and actually does not take into account other factors listed above or below. Additionally, this memo referenced traffic and trip generation impacts that are based on the original studies done by Fox Tuttle Transportation Group, LLC, on August 15, 2013, almost 8 years ago.

One example of growth since this original 2013 traffic study took place is Frost Creek. In 2013, there were 32 members and today there are 350. The dwelling units have increased from 97 to an approved 137 units. That increase in growth and associated traffic outside of school related traffic has not been taken into account to properly justify a proposed swap of school to be located right off BCR.

Another question comes into play as well with a proposed fire department and a school next to each other on the same street. Quoting the developer, *“the new school site would be located right across the street from the Haymeadow fire station.”* To create a literal sense of the question, what if while school is starting/ending with a line of cars in carpool waiting for their children to be dismissed, the fire department is dispatched with an emergency? How does that work or doesn’t it? What are the safety measures that would be in place and implemented with these two buildings within such close proximity to each other? Does this create a delay in emergency response? More importantly, does this put students, staff, and parents in harm’s way when an emergency response is needed, creating a safety hazard and dangerous situation?

-Developer continues: *“Other documents that we reviewed in our preparation were recently commissioned housing and economic reports specific to Eagle County. These studies illustrate the acute*

need and demand for quality workforce housing for locals who already live here, but struggle to find housing in a market desperately short of units." (Introduction-Page 5)

A denial of developer's request for a land swap **does not limit** Haymeadow workforce housing at all. Rather, it is a location issue only.

Keeping the approved PUD as is also allows the TOE to focus on population growth, transportation issues, and congestion in a more gradual sense following with the currently approved Haymeadow buildout neighborhoods A1-D, instead of Haymeadow's newly proposed plan to rapidly build ALL MF units on smaller acreage all at once.

With the Town growth rate of 1.85% per year and projections for the Eagle County population to reach 83,000 by 2040, (based on data from the Elevate Eagle Comprehensive Plan), the traffic issues continue to be a 'white elephant in the room'. This does not take into account the undermentioned developments in process. Current affordable approved housing plans indicate that between Talon Flats, Hockett Gulch, Eagle Landing, West Eagle Area Housing Project and Haymeadow named developments, there are multiple affordable housing units coming to market and others potentially in the future. One might also consider with the rapidly changing landscape due to COVID and home office/living at an all-time high, families/people exiting metropolitan areas in droves, that the current and future demographic and housing types may have changed as well. Data for this drastic change of lifestyle from Zoom jobbing to telecommuting has not been taken into account. With this and the aforementioned approved housing developments, another perspective might be that with the proposed amendment of Haymeadow to quickly and immediately build all MF units now in one concentrated area, this creates a pendulum effect of same-type units flooding the market when demand may be shifting.

-Developer indicates: *"Conversations with Eagle County School District confirmed no immediate need for an additional school in Phase 1 of Haymeadow." (Introduction-Page 5)*

It would be preferred for ECSD to affirm that statement, not a developer proposing a parcel swap which greatly financially benefits them. In addition, whether ECSD has an immediate need for a school or not, does not preclude developer from building their current approved A1 neighborhood.

-Developer introduces another component separate and unrelated to this land swap proposal: *"Our planning also reinvigorated early conversations surrounding the future of the original ranch manager's cabin/headquarters. As part of our proposal, we include a plan to redesign and activate the cabin area to the benefit of the community and as an economic engine for Eagle's businesses." (Introduction-Page 5)*

The manager's cabin would be located approximately 1 ½ miles into the Haymeadow property. This is being touted as a viable economic engine. State what studies were done to prove any economic viability? This cabin has no connection to the requested swap, however, seemingly appears to be a marketing incentive for a swap. Is Haymeadow planning to rejuvenate the cabin either way? There are currently no utilities or construction in the area of the manager's cabin. When would this rejuvenation actually take place and with what future phase of construction? How will this affect surrounding neighbors-human/animals with regards to traffic, noise, and other activities causing disruptions? Also, would the cabin be the TOE responsibility to maintain and provide upkeep ongoing, and at what cost, in actuality then the financial responsibility of the Eagle taxpayers?

-Developer states: *"The Haymeadow PUD was approved by TOE Ordinance N. 11, Series of 2014 after several years of PUD Concept Zoning Plan and PUD Zoning Plan review." (1.0 Description of Proposed Project-Page 5)*

The concept of time and effort that went into choosing the school site should be a reason to keep the school site as currently approved. If not, it creates a conflict with the Elevate Eagle Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 4.1.010 C in the current approved PUD, that various land use elements are designed so

that they inter-relate cohesively with each other. The boundary between the PUD and adjacent land areas was taken into consideration to follow the requirements with particular attention to ensure that land use patterns were compatible with the school site and adjacent recreational and future master planned recreational facilities.

1.1 School site amendment

Haymeadow developer would like to swap a 14.22-acre parcel and merge it with Neighborhood A1, which is 41.7 acres. This would create a 55.92-acre parcel for 340 units of MF housing. In this proposed amendment, all 112 units of MF housing from Neighborhoods B and C would shift from a combined total of a 108.1-acre site with SF/Duplexes, to a much more congested scenario on a much smaller parcel of land with MF units only. This creates a situation with potentially double or more than that in vehicle traffic (680 if using 2 vehicles per household) in a much smaller concentrated area. Elevate Eagle Comprehensive Plan provides data of 2.96 people per household so the vehicle count could potentially be higher.

NOTE: Developer released a plan drawing to Soleil residents indicating the existence of 8 24-unit buildings on the proposed swap land, exceeding the 35 ft height restriction with roof lines, including only 20 covered parking spots per building and what appears to be an additional 16 street spots per building. Doing the math, that is only 36 spots per building and with a 2-car per household number, the more realistic number is 48 total cars per building. It appears that Haymeadow short sided 12 cars per unit for parking (96 vehicles). Aesthetically that scenario alone could be viewed as congestion and surely not enough parking to accommodate real-life living conditions. Certainly, this does not fall within the visions of what Haymeadow refers to for the TOE's "country lane feel."

-Additionally, siting Haymeadow's PUD Annexation and Development Agreement Resolution 12 regarding LERP (Local Employee Residency Program), Haymeadow's original approval per Town guidelines encompassed their statement, *"The LERP units shall be dispersed in a reasonable manner throughout each neighborhood. There may be more than one LERP unit per building, and there may be multi-family buildings that contain three or more LERP units. However, all, or a significant concentration of, the required LERP units for each neighborhood shall not be located within one multi-family project or cluster of buildings."* (Haymeadow PUD Annexation and Development Agreement Resolution 12/LERP)

This statement by Haymeadow directly contradicts their new submittal proposing an amendment to the school land use, by instead requesting to build ALL the MF units/LERP in one cluster of same-type units in Neighborhood A.

NOTE: Haymeadow Amendment page 9 states 340 proposed units in A1 neighborhood chart. This conflicts with the Haymeadow Proposed Unit Count map page 8, detailing 380 total units in A1 neighborhood.

NOTE: This proposed amendment states that an 18.3-acre portion of Neighborhood C would be re-classified as school use. However, the Haymeadow Land Use Summary (Current Unit Count) and (Proposed Unit Count) map page 8, details in C that acreage would fall from 47.1 to 32.1. If understanding correctly reading this proposed amendment, that is only a differential of 15 acres. So, the proposed school land swap would actually only amount to less than an acre or .78 to the school?

-In a letter dated December 10, 2020, sent by Sandra Mutchler, CFO for Eagle County Schools to the TOE, it states, *"While both the existing and proposed school dedications are viable school sites, the proposed site is preferred due primarily to its size and location."*

If acreage size is actually only a .78 differential and the new location may pose questions related to potential safety dangers with emergency response issues, not to mention an adjacent busier road with posted higher speed limits (40), would the school entertain their original location as best suited for the school and synergy of activities? (Please also refer to Mountain Recreation letter submitted December 3,

2020 by Board President, Elizabeth Jones and Board Member, Tom Pohl, which does not favor a land swap.)

Or are the ECS administrators focusing on the Haymeadow developer-Abrika proposing to isolate five (5) housing units for sale only for ECS employees? If ECS doesn't own these units, how can Abrika only offer to ECS employees and not allow others in need of housing from potentially buying those units? What or who gives the developer the right or the legal authority to decide who buys and lives in this housing? Additionally, regarding the extension of road and utility improvements to the proposed school site, when would that take place and if a school may not be built for multiple years, how would that financially binding scenario be taken into consideration present day? Can Abrika even offer these incentives for ECS administrators' approval of a swap?

Haymeadow notes 24% of MF units will be designated as deed restricted. This 24% seems like a misleading figure, as the 83 units (24% of 344 all MF units) is actually the 10% requirement for the entire development of 837. Conversely, Hockett Gulch's website states 45% of their 396 rental units (178) will be deed restricted with no income restrictions.

-Developer voices: *"The current level of extreme housing demand for entry level and attainable units was not foreseen in the planning stages that took place prior to the 2014 approval."* (1.1 School Site Amendment-Page 9)

However, based on the Eagle Area Community Plan (EACP), referenced numerous times in this developer proposed amendment, the demand for entry level and attainable units has been stressed since 2010 and prior. Therefore, Haymeadow developer should have known and had all the available information at their disposal to make that decision in 2014.

-Developer states: *"The result is no increase in density from the overall approved PUD. The overall approval will remain at 837 dwelling units with the same breakdown of 344 multi-family units and 493 single family/duplex units."* (1.1 School Site Amendment-Page 9)

This statement is misleading in that the PUD density locationally would extremely change from the approved plan, making the front portion of the development exceptionally overcrowded and crammed if the school land swap is approved. Keeping the school land as is allows for ample and shared parking for events, creates less congestion with vehicles on street side parking around Mountain Rec area and Sylvan Lake Road parallel to Brush Creek Village, and keeps the original decisions to incorporate all activities with the school as approved. This may also become a source of income to the Town/ECS for paid event parking, including for out-of-town guest parking in the school lot when utilizing our Eagle outdoor amenities/trails and attending organized events around the Mountain Rec area. Based on the EACP, a discussion question was posed regarding how to reap more financial benefit from visitors to our community, this may create that option.

NOTE: Haymeadow Amendment page 9 states 340 proposed units in A1 neighborhood chart. This conflicts with the Haymeadow Proposed Unit Count map page 8, detailing 380 total units in A1 neighborhood. This is an increase in density if we are to follow Haymeadow developer's Proposed Unit Count map of page 8.

Under the TOE Amendments to PUD Zoning and Development Plans, Conditions for Amendment, this proposed amendment application does affect in a substantially adverse manner either the enjoyment of land abutting upon, adjoining or across a street from the planned unit development or the public interest, and therefore should not be approved. In this case, neighboring housing developments are adversely affected and through informal petitions signed and submitted to the TOE, have voiced their community support of opposition to any proposed amendment of a school land swap. In addition, Mountain Recreation representatives have outlined in a letter dated December 3, 2020, their multiple

reasons why an approval of a land swap would adversely affect Mountain Recreation services and residents of the TOE in general. They have referenced the 'Conditions for Amendment' as well.

-Developer admits: *"Recognizing that this is a change in use that could be viewed as potentially impactful to the adjacent Soleil neighborhood Haymeadow is willing to commit to a 300-foot vertical building setback from the Soleil boundary and to landscape within that setback area in a manner that will create a strong buffer area between the two residential uses."* (1.1.2 Tract E/Neighborhood A, Detailed Description-Page 10)

In the statement above, developer points out in their proposed amendment application that the Haymeadow amendment does affect in a substantially adverse manner, the residents of Soleil. In what appears to be a diversion from compliance, Haymeadow attempts to mask the situation with landscape suggestions that are not acceptable. The homeowners of Soleil have overwhelmingly and collectively voiced their opposition to this proposed amendment to swap school land with a MF unit development; additionally, the noncompliance per section 4.11.050A(2) still exists.

-Developer indicates: *"the approved PUD Development Plan would be amended to enlarge the existing Neighborhood A1 area to include the 14.2 acres of Tract E and the 14.2 acres would be designated for multi-family construction. The existing multi-family density of 112 units that is currently approved for Neighborhoods B & C would be transferred to Neighborhood A1. Neighborhood A1 is the closest neighborhood to the community core and at 41.7 acres is currently approved for 146 multi-family units and 82 single family/duplex units. In accordance with the objectives of the Eagle Area Community Plan Neighborhood A1 is the highest density neighborhood at 5.4 units per acre. The addition of 14.2 acres and 112 units would shift Neighborhood A1 slightly higher to a density of 6 units per acre."* (1.1.2 Tract E/Neighborhood A, Detailed Description-Page 10/11)

Based on the TOE Amendments to PUD Zoning and Development Plans, Conditions for Amendment, section 4.11.050(3), this proposed amendment confers a special benefit upon the developer, demonstrating a conflict with the proposed modification to swap the school land. In hindsight and maybe a glaring lack of planning, the developer now proposes this condensed housing scenario in an effort to reduce or recoup costs at tremendous expense to surrounding neighbors/hoods. As stated, prior, the developer had access to all data and information regarding the housing needs of the TOE. This proposed amendment not getting approved, does not prohibit the developer from building the currently approved PUD, which provides a better distribution of the PUD zone districts throughout the development, ultimately one of the reasons for the initial PUD approval. Refer also to the aforementioned Haymeadow's PUD Annexation and Development Agreement Resolution 12 regarding LERP (Local Employee Residency Program).

-The developer suggests: *"We anticipate this (manager's cabin) creating a multi-million-dollar economic opportunity for local businesses."* (For 1.2 Cabin Special Events Venue-page 11)

This statement is based on what data collected or proof that this will be a viable entity for local businesses or the TOE, especially the Eagle residents who provide the tax base to run and maintain such an entity? Has the developer actually provided a cost analysis to the TOE for expenses associated with this cabin both short and long term: maintenance, insurance, liability coverage, water/septic system maintenance, employee costs, parking costs, shuttle costs, etc? With that in mind, would the TOE require an approval from the residents to acquire the cabin? Please also refer to manager's cabin remarks in the introduction section above.

-The developer attempts to mollify by adding: *"Haymeadow does not anticipate any extension of Field Street through the Soleil neighborhood into Haymeadow."* (Access and Traffic-page 17)

What does "not anticipate" mean in developer terminology? Please clarify based on the PUD approved plans. This should be a definite statement.

Please also refer to Mountain Recreation letter submitted December 3, 2020 by Board President, Elizabeth Jones and Board Member, Tom Pohl, referencing their concerns about any potential extension of Field Street. "One item to note based on the public planning process for the Haymaker Trailhead Concept Plan: The proposed PUD Amendment concept plan illustrating the school parcel does not fully match the adopted Haymaker Trailhead Concept Plan's outline for the school portion of the parcel, as uses were blended. The proposed parcel boundary shown appears to suggest that a road centerline could be constructed from the current terminus of Field Street to the future unnamed street connecting to Neighborhood A. The impacts of traffic flows through the adjoining neighborhood were considered during the concept planning process following resident comment and review of the Soleil development plans. The Haymaker Trailhead concept plan specifically included installation of a gate past the Field Street terminus with the idea that the gate was intended to be opened only for special events such the CHSAA regional and state mountain bike competitions or large tournaments. Traffic flows created by opening a street from Soleil Homes through a multi-family development to Neighborhood A1 may trigger a desire to review projected traffic impacts to the Soleil neighborhood based on that public input process."

-The developer states: "The applicant has had an early conversation with representatives of the Greater Eagle Fire Protection District. At this time there are no identified negative impacts associated with the shift in location of the school and multi-family uses. The new school site would be located right across the street from the Haymeadow fire station." "The cabin will continue to be accessed via the existing driveway from Brush Creek Road. This driveway will be improved and widened to a year-round gravel surface with pull-off lanes. The increase in traffic on Brush Creek Road will be minimal compared to the background traffic levels given the intent to have large events shuttled to the site." (For 2.0 Access and Traffic, Emergency Services-page 17)

It is preferred that the Greater Eagle Fire Protection District voice whether any negative impacts can and will be identified with potentially moving the school land, rather than a developer who would benefit from a swap stating, at this time none exist.

Regarding the proposed school swap to Neighborhood C, for students/staff members and especially as a parent, the red flag is being raised about safety issues. Having a fire department directly across the street that would potentially have emergency dispatch situations simultaneously occurring during a congested drop-off or pick-up with carpool lines, parents, staff, and students in close proximity or blocking throughways, doesn't sound as though no negative impacts exist with a shift in school location. Additionally, students (K-8th grade) that may ride their bikes to school create further trepidations for safety when firetrucks may be racing to an emergency while conceivably having to dodge children at the same time. There is a higher speed limit (40) on BCR and stop signs that would be placed at the entrance to BCR. All of this would cause additional backups to BCR access and congestion on a street that hypothetically would house the school and the fire department. One might conclude that all of this certainly seems to lend itself to negative impacts.

Due to the emergency concerns and potential negative impacts for the land swap of school to Neighborhood C, it is important to reiterate what might occur if the developer is allowed to proceed with a swap. This creates a snowballing effect with BCR access: increased traffic and congestion mentioned above, noise pollution related to manager's cabin events, safety issues with the close proximity of a fire department to a school, higher posted speeds of 40 on BCR and current flow of traffic going to and from Sylvan Lake, Frost Creek, trails, ranches/homesteads and soon from Ouzel once connected. Has the developer or TOE actively reached out to BCR/Eagle Ranch residents especially near Ouzel, letting them know of this proposal? With all of this in mind, we feel the current approved school location actually emulates the "country land feel" better in its setting, safety with traffic speeds, and less congestion.

Finally, in response to this proposed Haymeadow PUD Amendment 2020, as residents of Soleil and surrounding neighborhoods, please take these statements and responses to this proposal into serious consideration as to why this swap of land should not happen. Notwithstanding our stated concerns, questions, and objections to the proposed school swap, we reserve the right to consult with counsel to determine if legal action is necessary to protect our interests.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Your Soleil and surrounding Eagle residents and neighbors.

From: [Andrew Broderick](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Opposition to the Haymeadow Swap
Date: Sunday, February 14, 2021 :13:44 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Ms. Lake,

On the behalf of myself and my family - Katherine, my wife and Robert, my son, we, residents of 1380 Montgomerie Circle, Eagle, CO 81631, voice our strenuous opposition to the Haymeadow Swap.

While our reasons for opposition are multiple, the most pressing are:

1. obstructed views of my greater organization and subsequent property value deterioration
2. traffic...will not only suffuse a "hometown" level to a more congested dynamic but we lose the shared parking that Mountain Recreation enjoys.
3. multi-family homes dynamic is visually, aesthetically and economically unsettling

I am pleased to visit with you, via Zoom, and/or to share my feedback in a public forum.

Many thanks
Andy Broderick
(970) 343-0035

From: [alan musser](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Cc: [mikeclaymon@hotmail.com](#)
Subject: Haymeadow Swap
Date: Monday, February 15, 2021 12:22 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jessica, I live on Eagle Ranch Road 2315, and want to state emphatically that I OPPOSE the land swap the developer is proposing.

Here are my key reasons:

- The Board and developer worked long and hard to come up with the plan that is the current Plan, and has been in place for years. There is no compelling reason to change the result of all that hard work.
- The developer is concerned about financial impacts, those are the developer's issues, not residents and not the town. Don't let the developer distort their concerns on the Board.
- We were told when we decided to build here in 2015, in the city offices by Tom Forget last name but he was town manager before Randy, that Rush Creek would remain a 2 lane country road in perpetuity.
- The proposed location change only benefits the developer, not the town. With the school in original location the developer can still build the entire development according to the original plan.
- The offer to rebuild and turn the cabin into an attraction is a cheap, little distraction. It has nothing to do with core issue, which is what was approved in the original Plan, and that there is NO compelling reason to make any changes. Don't be distracted by the developer putting up this shiny object.

I am trusting that the Board will make the right decision for the residents of this town, not for some out of state developer. I will be at the Plan meeting on March 2.

Thank you,

I Musser
2315 Eagle Ranch Rd

From: [Kirstin Shaw](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: P 20 21 Haymeadow P Ma or mendment
Date: Monday, February 15, 2021 3:03 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

As an adjacent land owner I would like to respond to the proposed amendments for the Haymeadow development.

1. Where would the school ground be swapped? Currently its location is ideal for minimizing traffic any further out of the town.

2. Renovating the cabin on open space for use as an event center would be in direct conflict with what the DOW has recommended in complying with avoidance of critical wildlife habitat. This cabin has been a key location for wintering elk populations and continues to be a calving site in the spring. There is also a large hunting presence in the fall which would present a danger to any event attendees. Personally I think it is a terrible idea to encourage people to loiter in large numbers in close proximity to our wildlife areas.

3. I would like to again suggest an amendment to NOT PAVE the walking path against the Norther border of the development, thus making it seasonal and not maintained by the town in snowy months. This would encourage pedestrian traffic to migrate centrally rather than the outer borders of the development against critical wildlife habitat.

Thank you,
Kirstin Shaw
2189 Brush Creek Rd Eagle

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Frank Mc Cluer](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Haymeadow Swap
Date: uesday, February 1 , 2021 2:45:23 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Elaine Kuntz
Frank McCluer
PO Box 3265
(3101 Montgomerie Circle)
Eagle CO, 81631

To:
Jessica Lake

We would like to comment on the Haymeadow Swap that is to be on the agenda at town meetings.

We live in the neighborhood and oppose the swap and change in plans.

The original location made good sense and would benefit the Mountain Recreation and town with shared facilities. Parking for both school and events seemed a good plan.

We worry that parking will be a problem that could even affect our street if a high density complex is in that area.

Having the park and school in the current location seemed like a plus for the neighborhood and we want to see it happen.

Elaine Kuntz
Frank McCluer

From: [_a_id_ieter](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Haymeadow school relocation
Date: Sunday, February 21, 2021 5:1 :25 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jessica: I oppose the movement of the planned school. This is a move by the developer to save money at our expense. If you have ever been around a school such as this at pick-up time you

know; the traffic is intense. They should be held to the original plan. Their action is text book bait-and-switch. Bait-and-switch is illegal in this state-oh wait its illegal in all states!

Dave Dieter
17 Fir Ct., Eagle

From: [R R](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
c: [Mike laymon](#)
Subject: Haymeadow school site
Date: Sunday, February 21, 2021 5:2 :24 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Jessica--

I am writing with regard to the proposed change in location for the school in the Haymeadow development. I believe that changing this location is not in keeping with what everyone in the surrounding area expected. This is a huge development that will already have major impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods, and those residents deserve to have things built according to the original plan.

There were also extensive analyses of the area that would have to be ignored in order to make this swap. Any problems the developer has with the original location are those of the developer and should not be foisted upon the surrounding neighborhoods. The original location also has safety, traffic and resource advantages that would be lost in the swap.

There are many other reasons for denying this swap, but the ones stated above should be more than enough to justify denial. Please considering refusing to allow this huge change in Eagle to have any further negative impacts. Thank you. Debra Dieter 303.549.7857

From: [Linda ennett](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Opposition to proposed Haymeadow land swap
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 4:0 :5 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am vehemently opposed to the Haymeadow school land swap and I strongly encourage denial of this proposal for the following reasons:

1. Every Soleil homeowner relied on the original PUD approval when purchasing at Soleil Homes and accepted that a school was slated to be built adjacent to Soleil. Swapping the school parcel for high density housing will negatively affect Soleil's property values. It is unacceptable to allow this land swap solely to financially benefit a private developer at the expense of Soleil homeowners.
2. The only reason the developer is proposing this swap is because of his mismanagement of the construction process and his inability to oversee a construction project of this magnitude. This development has taken 17 years to get to this point. The only person who benefits from the swap is the developer - not the people of Eagle.
3. The developer would like this swap to happen because the infrastructure that is currently in place does not reach where the multi-family units need to be. He wants to build the inexpensive units to sell them to fund the next stage of the development. The swap would negatively impact Soleil homeowners due to reduced property values from adjacent high density housing and blocked mountain views. Soleil homeowners should not bear the burden of the developer's financial challenges.
4. As stated in the submittal, "In accordance with the Town of Eagle Code Section 4.11.050 an approved PUD zoning plan or an approved PUD development plan may be amended if the applicant demonstrates that the proposed modification: 2. Does not affect in a substantially adverse manner either the enjoyment of land abutting upon, adjoining or across a street from the Planned Unit Development or the public interest." Soleil homeowners will absolutely be substantially adversely affected due to reduced property values resulting from moving the high density units closer to Soleil, and due to obstruction of mountain views, which the developer admits.
5. The original site was chosen for the school to decrease traffic and to share facilities and fields with the Town of Eagle and Mountain Recreation. The school kids would be able to have walkable access to fields, bike trails, playgrounds, skating rinks, skate parks, and more. By moving the school a mile away, this all but eliminates the possibility for Eagle's children to benefit from the Town's vision. Additionally, by having the school in its planned

location, the Town of Eagle will be able to host even more bike and hockey tournaments, thus bringing in significant revenue.

6. Mountain Recreation is strongly opposed to the school land swap PUD amendment as indicated in their referral response. Eagle Pool and Ice Rink expansion plans are already in progress using the current school location. This proposal reduces opportunities for shared facilities between the school and Mountain Recreation as well as eliminating shared parking between Mountain Recreation and the school.

7. During the PUD process there was an extensive traffic study regarding the school placement in an effort to avoid traffic issues currently experienced with Brush Creek Elementary. Traffic patterns will be negatively impacted by the proposed school location, and a potentially dangerous and unsafe situation would be created with the new location of the school being adjacent to the Haymeadow fire station.

8. In the original school site, these multi-family units will not conform to the Elevate Eagle plans in a variety of ways, including density, look, feel, location relative to I-70 and business and bus lines, and intention.

9. If this proposal is denied, the developer can still proceed with this development and affordable housing options can still be provided according to the existing PUD. If it is approved, surrounding homeowners cannot recover their property values and mountain views.

Thank you for your consideration.


Linda Bennett

From: [_a_id_lum](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Please do not swap the Haymeadow school site.
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 10:52:32 M

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jessica.

I'm sending you this email to express my opposition to swapping the school site for the Haymedow development, per this petition: [Petition Stop the Haymeadow Swap!](#).



I'm a homeowner at 301 Tanager street. I purchased this property partially because of the planned school next to the Ice Rink.

Please let me know if this email should be directed elsewhere.

Thank you

David Blum
301 Tanager St
970-471-9384.

SIGN IN JOIN CONTRIBUTE



Lizzy Owens 10

Stop the Haymeadow Swap!

33 people have signed this petition. Add your name now! →

33 people have signed.

4%

Brian Pichon signed recently

We, the undersigned, vehemently oppose the planned site swap proposed by the Haymeadow Developer. The Developer proposes taking the current school site and swapping it with one close to a mile away. In the original school site, the Developer would like to build approximately 200 multi-family units that are three-stories tall.

The Developer would like this swap to happen because the infrastructure that is currently in place does not reach where the multi-family units need would be, and he will build the inexpensive units to sell them to fund the next stage of the development.

The original site was chosen for the school to decrease traffic and to share facilities and fields with the Town of Eagle and Mountain Rec. The school kids would be able to have walkable access to fields, bike trails, playgrounds, skating rinks, skate parks, and more. By moving the school a mile away, this all but eliminates the possibility for Eagle's children to benefit from the Town's vision. Additionally, by having the school in its planned location, the Town of Eagle will be able to host even more bike and hockey tournaments, thus bringing in significant revenue.

SIGN PETITION

business and bus lines, intention), including offering enough parking. They are

claimed to be workforce housing, but there is not a single bus route that goes through Eagle Ranch.

The only reason that the Developer is proposing this swap is because of his mismanagement of the construction process and his inability to oversee a construction project of this magnitude. The only person who benefits from the swap is the Developer--not the people of Eagle.

Share for Success

10 COMMENTS

Gregory Meister
Feb 22, 2021

Feb 22, 2021
upvote reply show

The developer needs to stick to the original plan, that was agreed to.

Julia Parker
Feb 22, 2021

Feb 22, 2021
upvote reply show

No swap. The project as a whole does not seem very well planned to meld with our Eagle Community. Changing what was already controversial approval of development does not make sense. Any way to re-write the whole script out there and use the Colby place as an example and create ranchettes. Just thinking out loud.

John and Karen Field
Feb 13, 2021

Feb 13, 2021
upvote reply show

Block views, Properties Value, congestion

Dave Gerdes
Feb 13, 2021

Feb 13, 2021
upvote reply show

The developer has failed to plan and communicate. There does not appear to be a good reason for this change that benefits anyone but the developer. Take a look at the status updates on Haymeadow.com to see the developers total lack of communication to the community.

Linda McLaughlin
Feb 13, 2021

Feb 13, 2021
upvote reply show

Please don't allow the swap to take place. The best plan is already in place.

Janice Tonz
Feb 13, 2021

Feb 13, 2021
upvote reply show

SIGN PETITION

Laura Howe
Feb 12, 2021

Feb 12, 2021
upvote reply show

I vehemently oppose the Haymeadow Swap.

Peter Leibig
Feb 12, 2021

upvote reply show
Feb 12, 2021

Stop the Swap!

RIC TURMEL
Feb 12, 2021

Feb 12, 2021
upvote reply show

The developer's error/lack of resources should not be assisted by the government.

Brian Bishop
Feb 12, 2021

Feb 12, 2021
upvote reply show

Absolutely not... this will impact our home value as soon as it's put in place.

[Sign in](#) to comment

33 SIGNATURES

- 4 hours ago
Devra DiDomenico United States
- 4 hours ago
- 4 hours ago
- LaRae Keyes United States
- 4 hours ago
- 4 hours ago
- Beth Morrison United States
- 4 hours ago
- 4 hours ago
- Gregory Meister United States
- 4 hours ago
- 4 hours ago
- Lori Tarpey United States
- 4 hours ago
- 5 hours ago
- James Suhadolink United States
- 5 hours ago
- 5 hours ago
- Angie Kriedeman United States
- 5 hours ago
- 6 hours ago
- Julia Parker United States
- 6 hours ago
- 22 hours ago
- David Dieter United States
- 22 hours ago
- 22 hours ago
- Debra S Dieter United States
- 22 hours ago

[See More](#)

SIGN PETITION

From: [_atie_arden](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Haymaker Land Swap O ection
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 11:35:3 M
ttac me t : [Pasted_raphic_1.png](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Jessica,

My name is Katie Carden. My family recently moved from Breckenridge to Eagle. My husband has worked in the Valley for years and commuted from Breck. We were so excited to finally move west to this wonderful community We purchased our home in May of 2020 in the Soleil Homes at Brush Creek. We purchased after considerable evaluation of the various neighborhoods in Eagle. We were fully aware of plans of the Haymaker development. The developer, however, is trying to change those plans. Below are the reasons we believe the proposed land swap should be denied:

- 1) Surrounding homeowners bought homes based on the advantages of the current school location
- 2) Negatively impacts surrounding homeowners due to reduced property values and blocked mountain views
- 3) Disregards the extensive process by TOE and ECSD during the PUD process to determine the best school location
- 4) Consequences of the inadequate planning and budget mismanagement should be the burden of the developer and not surrounding homeowners
- 5) Affects surrounding homeowners in a substantially adverse manner and should be denied per TOE Code Section 4.11.050
- 6) Results in a chopped up development
- 7) Reduces opportunities for shared facilities between the school and Mountain Recreation
- 8) Shared parking between Mountain Recreation and the school is eliminated
- 9) Traffic patterns will be negatively impacted by the proposed school location
- 10) A potentially dangerous and unsafe situation would be created with the new location of the school being adjacent to the Haymeadow fire station
- 11) Clustering multi-family units in a small area results in traffic and parking problems
- 12) The “country lane feel” of Brush Creek Road is negatively impacted
- 13) Eagle Pool and Ice Rink expansion plans are already in progress using the current school location
- 14) Mountain Recreation is strongly opposed to the school land swap PUD amendment
- 15) If this proposal is denied, the developer can still build Haymeadow according to the existing PUD
- 16) If this proposal is denied, affordable housing options can still be provided according to the existing PUD
- 17) The proposed school location only benefits the developer by allowing deferral of some infrastructure costs
- 18) Keeping the school in its current location is just common sense which is why that location was chosen originally

Thank you for your service and investment in our community!

Katie Carden

720.539.5890
Vail Valley Young Life
WyldLife Director



From: [Mike Jaymon](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Haymeadow Land swap opposition letter
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 4:02:5 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello,

I am opposed to the Haymeadow school land swap and I strongly encourage denial of this proposal for the following reasons:

KEEPING THE SCHOOL IN ITS CURRENT LOCATION IS JUST COMMON SENSE WHICH IS WHY THE CURRENT LOCATION WAS CHOSEN ORIGINALLY.

1. Every Soleil homeowner relied on the original PUD approval when purchasing at Soleil Homes and accepted that a school was slated to be built adjacent to Soleil. Swapping the school parcel for high density housing will negatively affect Soleil's property values. It is unacceptable to allow this land swap solely to financially benefit a private developer at the expense of Soleil homeowners.
2. The developer claims that the real estate market has changed since the PUD approval in 2014. Because of this, they want to build the high density housing sooner and in a location closer to the beginning of the development. The real estate market changes constantly, and if the developer had not had so many delays perhaps he could have taken advantage of the market as it was at the time of his original proposal. Also, if they didn't foresee this housing demand in 2014, they were the only ones in the whole valley who didn't know about it. This has been a problem since I have lived in Eagle County for the last 31 years and is not a reason to change the location of the school. If this proposal is denied, affordable housing options can still be provided according to the existing PUD.
3. The proposed land swap financially benefits the developer due to deferring infrastructure costs. It negatively impacts Soleil homeowners due to reduced property values from adjacent high density housing and blocked mountain views. Soleil homeowners should not bear the burden of the developer's financial challenges.
4. The placement of the school was extensively thought through by Town of Eagle staff and the school board during the PUD process. There was an extensive traffic study regarding the school placement in an effort to avoid traffic issues currently experienced with Brush Creek Elementary. It was decided that they didn't want traffic driving through a neighborhood. Additionally, the original location allows the school and Mountain Recreation to share facilities and resources. The location of the school should not be changed because of the developer's financial issues.
5. This development has taken 17 years to get to this point which shows very inadequate planning. The developer submitted and received approval for a specific land distribution, which Soleil homeowner's relied upon. Now the developer wants to defer infrastructure costs, so is proposing the land swap, which again highlights his inadequate planning. The consequences of the inadequate planning and budget mismanagement should be the burden of the developer and not surrounding homeowners.
6. The ECSD support for the land swap is ONLY about the perspective of a new school and has NOTHING to do with what is best for the community and how it affects neighboring homeowners and our community as a whole.
7. As stated in the submittal in the introduction, they talk about several seemingly noble reasons that they are proposing this amendment such as increased density nearer the town, and workforce housing for locals. Don't be fooled. The real reason, as they told us at a meeting on 10/23, is all about money and deferring infrastructure costs and has nothing to do with helping the community.
8. As stated in the submittal, "In accordance with the Town of Eagle Code Section 4.11.050 an approved PUD zoning plan or an approved PUD development plan may be amended if the applicant demonstrates that the proposed modification: 2. Does not affect in a substantially adverse manner either the enjoyment of land abutting upon, adjoining or across a street from the Planned Unit Development or the public interest." Soleil homeowners are absolutely substantially adversely affected due to the reduced property values by moving the high density closer to Soleil and obstruction of mountain views, which the developer admits.
9. Mountain Recreation is strongly opposed to the school land swap PUD amendment as indicated in their referral response. Eagle Pool and Ice Rink expansion plans are already in progress using the current school location. This proposal reduces opportunities for shared facilities between the school and Mountain Recreation as well as eliminating shared parking between Mountain Recreation and the school.
10. Traffic patterns will be negatively impacted by the proposed school location and a potentially dangerous and unsafe situation would be created with the new location of the school being adjacent to the Haymeadow fire station.
11. Clustering multi-family units in a small area results in traffic and parking problems and the "country lane feel" of Brush Creek Road will be negatively impacted. From an architectural perspective, this proposal results in a "chopped up" development which just looks bad.
12. If this proposal is denied, the developer can still proceed with this development. If it is approved, surrounding homeowners cannot recover their property values and mountain views.

█

KEEPING THE SCHOOL IN ITS CURRENT LOCATION IS JUST COMMON SENSE WHICH IS WHY THE CURRENT LOCATION WAS CHOSEN ORIGINALLY.

█

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration.

█

Mike Claymon
116 Soleil Circle
Eagle, CO

█

From: [my_ornikiewicz](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Haymeadow Land Swap
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 4:41:1 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please add our names to the list of residents opposed to the Haymeadow land swap for the following reasons, as well as those listed below by our fellow residents/neighbor's.

- **INAPPROPRIATE MIX:** though the Area plan does call for concentration within designated growth boundaries, it also mentions not putting unlike or inappropriately matched developments together such that one will negatively impact the other. A low rent housing project would most certainly do this. Also, it would be one thing if we had known this BEFORE we purchased our homes adjacent to this property.
- **VIEW CORRIDORS:** the plan also states that new development should not negatively impact view corridors. The Hey Meadow development has already done so with some of their landscaping, and these proposed buildings, according to the architectural virtual illustration, will severely do so if this swap is approved. Many residents bought their homes predominantly (some even paid a premium) BECAUSE of these views, and the enhanced resale value which would be negatively impacted by this development. Again, it would be different if people knew upfront. If the proposed units were positioned differently to help maintain views, and their proposed berm/landscaping hid more of the buildings, some of us might be slightly more receptive?
- **LIFESTYLE:** you can spin it however you like, but these units as well as other inappropriate future development the town has approved, will NOT be affordable housing for those intended. It WILL be just more affordable housing for slum lords and for profit property interests. Thus, these so-called affordable units will not be affordable to the intended market, especially the teachers etc, used as a selling point by the developer. NOTE: the average teacher salary in Eagle county is \$49,060 per year, making these units hardly affordable. This will only make our existing housing problem worse, by adding more unaffordable rental units, that will be overpopulated in order for the residents to afford rent. Add to this equation, the added, unaccounted for number of vehicles that this will cause i.e., (unintended roommates, overnight boy/girl friends, couch surfers etc). Thereby adding significantly more people than intended and adding parking problems. This, and the coming and going at all hours due to the shifts required for service workers, will also have a negative impact on lifestyle of our neighboring development. Again, many bought in our development because this would not be a factor.

Though it is unfortunate that the developer has mismanaged the project and is over budget, it is ridiculous and inappropriate to even consider forcing residents to be socially, psychologically and economically impacted because of this.

Many of our neighbors purchased their Soleil homes based on the FACTS contained in the existing development plans, therefore it is highly reprehensible and inappropriate to approve this swap for this reason alone, let alone the above mentioned idiosyncrasies, as well as the 18 reasons below.

As long time tax paying Eagle homeowners, we respectfully call on you to protect our interests and lifestyles, by doing the right thing and rejecting this swap!

Thank you for your time!

Anxiously,

Amy Gornikiewicz

Pete Danforth

- 1) Surrounding homeowners bought homes based on the advantages of the current school location
- 2) Negatively impacts surrounding homeowners due to reduced property values and blocked mountain views
- 3) Disregards the extensive process by TOE and ECSD during the PUD process to determine the best school location
- 4) Consequences of the inadequate planning and budget mismanagement should be the burden of the developer and not surrounding homeowners
- 5) Affects surrounding homeowners in a substantially adverse manner and should be denied per TOE Code Section 4.11.050
- 6) Results in a chopped up development
- 7) Reduces opportunities for shared facilities between the school and Mountain Recreation
- 8) Shared parking between Mountain Recreation and the school is eliminated
- 9) Traffic patterns will be negatively impacted by the proposed school location
- 10) A potentially dangerous and unsafe situation would be created with the new location of the school being adjacent to the Haymeadow fire station
- 11) Clustering multi-family units in a small area results in traffic and parking problems
- 12) The "country lane feel" of Brush Creek Road is negatively impacted
- 13) Eagle Pool and Ice Rink expansion plans are already in progress using the current school location
- 14) Mountain Recreation is strongly opposed to the school land swap PUD amendment
- 15) If this proposal is denied, the developer can still build Haymeadow according to the existing PUD
- 16) If this proposal is denied, affordable housing options can still be provided according to the existing PUD
- 17) The proposed school location only benefits the developer by allowing deferral of some infrastructure costs
- 18) Keeping the school in its current location is just common sense which is why that

location was chosen originally

Amy Gornikiewicz
Pete Danforth
106 Soleil Circle
(Box 721)
Eagle 81631

From: [Melissa Johnson](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Haymeadow swap
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 10:42:5 M

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Jessica,

We live in the Soleil area and we oppose the land swap for many reasons all of which I am sure you have heard. For us it is mainly about the land swap affecting coordination between mountain Rec and the new school and how the swaps effects the expansion of Rec facilities which I feel is hugely important.

We are also concerned about traffic and parking in our area as many kids play and bike here.

Thanks for passing our objections along,
Melissa Johnson

From: [LaRae Keyes](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Haymeadow Project
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 4:03:54 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Jessica,

My husband, Bruce, and I adamantly oppose the proposed Haymeadow Project updates. We moved from Colorado Spring to Eagle in July 2019 and looked at several homes before deciding upon 26 Soleil Circle. Although, we were a little leary of the proposed plans. Now, we're LIVID at what the developer is trying to do.

Everyone that purchased in Soleil Homes did so with the understanding of the school being behind our neighborhood with fields and facilities shared with Mountain Recreation. Most of us would NOT have purchased in Soleil Homes had the tentative updated plans been in place.

We also bought our home with the understanding that Eagle County Schools are currently shrinking and it would likely be 10 plus year before a school was even feasible.

The developer has stated to our neighborhood that he wants the land swap because he's out of money and with the land swap he doesn't have to put in more utilities. Quite frankly, that's NOT our problem. My husband has a bachelor's degree in Construction Management and the amount of time it has taken to put in the current utilities and road is ridiculous. Bruce has worked on numerous constructions sites and we had our own residential construction company from 2004-2009. It is very apparent that the developer has NO idea what he's doing.

It baffles us that the developer intends to put 200+ units right behind our neighborhood with the intention of charging over \$400 per square foot. The homes in Soleil are much nicer and most of us bought them between \$200-\$250 square foot. This does not support the town's concerns about creating more affordable housing.

Another concern is all noise level behind our neighborhood with multiple level condos and apartments. Again, we purchased our home with the understanding that a school was to be placed in that location. The added traffic is also a concern to our neighborhood and the town of Eagle. Eby Creek, Capitol Street, Grand Avenue are already to the max during "rush hour." The airport expanding has further increased our traffic. Should the Haymeadow project go through as intended this will add hundreds of cars going through already congested areas. I have yet to hear of the town adding another I-70 exit to support the Eagle Airport, Costco, Eagle Ranch Community and the new Haymeadow Project.

Bruce and I hope you take our concerns with serious consideration. We're thrilled that Mountain Recreation has also stated that they do NOT want the land swap as to share facilities with the school later on. It's important to keep Eagle as a family community without devaluing our property. The land swap devalues all of the properties within Soleil Homes.

Thanks,
LaRae and Bruce Keyes
26 Soleil Circle

719-237-5741

From: [Reba Steffen](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: e object to the hay meadow swop
Date: Monday, February 22, 2021 4:31 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello Jessica and community!

My family requests the development of the hay meadow plan stay intact and not be changed with a new plan. Please stand by integrity. The swop does not sound like a good idea for our neighborhood. It is essential we keep the school easily accessible. Plus it only makes sense it is near the Rec center. Please make this a priority. The children will thrive with these collaborative resources. Parents will feel confidence they are raising children in the right place. This is a foundation for a healthy community.

Thank you for your service,

Rebecca Steffen
572 Montgomerie Circle

From: [Sue Baran](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Proposed Haymeadow Land Swap
Date: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 5:34:04 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Jessica,

We strongly oppose the proposed Haymeadow Land swap currently under consideration. We own a house on Field Street and would be negatively impacted by this change.

The current proposed land swap benefits the developer to fix his inadequate infrastructure planning while reducing our home value and those of our neighbors. The high concentration of the multi-family housing and lack of planning for parking and traffic considerations will be a burden on current homeowners.

Because we live on Field Street, we are concerned about it being made a through street to this new development which would cause a large amount of traffic on our street. When we purchased this property, the current PUD had been approved and as far as we understand, such a substantial change to the plans would not be allowed as an amendment.

As homeowners in the Soleil area, we are in agreement with the Stop the Haymeadow Swap Committee's Response to Haymeadow PUD Amendment 2020 and urge you to consider the many concerns and reasons for opposition shared in that letter.

Thank you for your consideration,
Susan and Jeff Baran
74 Field Street
Eagle, CO 81631

From: kakerekes_aol.com
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: P 20 01 Haymeadow P amendment
Date: uesday, February 23, 2021 12:51:54 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I am opposed to the Haymeadow land swap. My opposition is based on my understanding of the following.

Thank you.

Karla Kerekes 0039 Baler Ct

- 1) Surrounding homeowners bought homes based on the advantages of the current school location
- 2) Negatively impacts surrounding homeowners due to reduced property values and blocked mountain views
- 3) Disregards the extensive process by TOE and ECSD during the PUD process to determine the best school location
- 4) Consequences of the inadequate planning and budget mismanagement should be the burden of the developer and not surrounding homeowners
- 5) Affects surrounding homeowners in a substantially adverse manner and should be denied per TOE Code Section 4.11.050
- 6) Results in a chopped up development
- 7) Reduces opportunities for shared facilities between the school and Mountain Recreation
- 8) Shared parking between Mountain Recreation and the school is eliminated
- 9) Traffic patterns will be negatively impacted by the proposed school location
- 10) A potentially dangerous and unsafe situation would be created with the new location of the school being adjacent to the Haymeadow fire station
- 11) Clustering multi-family units in a small area results in traffic and parking problems
- 12) The "country lane feel" of Brush Creek Road is negatively impacted
- 13) Eagle Pool and Ice Rink expansion plans are already in progress using the current school location
- 14) Mountain Recreation is strongly opposed to the school land swap PUD amendment
- 15) If this proposal is denied, the developer can still build Haymeadow according to the existing PUD
- 16) If this proposal is denied, affordable housing options can still be provided according to the existing PUD
- 17) The proposed school location only benefits the developer by allowing deferral of some infrastructure costs
- 18) Keeping the school in its current location is just common sense which is why that location was chosen originally

From: [Linda McLaughlin](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Hay meadow pro ect
Date: uesday, February 23, 2021 5:05:12 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello!

Please leave the development plans as is. They aren't broke. Don't try and fix them!!!

Regards,

Linda McLaughlin
0644 Montgomerie Cir.
Eagle, CO 81631
303-908-0862

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Lizzy Acharias Owens](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Opposition to Haymeadow or the P&Z Committee
Date: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 11:23:00 AM
Attachment: [P...pd](#)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hi Jessica,

Attached is my letter of opposition for the Haymeadow Swap. I have something else pending-
-what's the time limit for submission to be included in the P&Z Committee packet?

Thanks!
-Lizzy

February 23, 2021

Dear Town of Eagle Planning & Zoning Committee Members:

I am writing to you as a Soleil homeowner to express my ardent opposition to the proposed land swap from the Haymeadow Development. I moved to Eagle in December 2018 into the Soleil neighborhood, and I did so with the understanding of what the surrounding area would look like in the near- and long-term future. That understanding included a school neighboring my development's property. In the past few months, I was incredibly disappointed to learn about the proposed land swap, for the following reasons:

- As stated above, I bought my house with the knowledge that there would be a school close by to our neighborhood. I was excited about that prospect, and even more so when we realized that the school would feed into the proposed Mountain Rec community center.
- Some of our neighbors paid a premium for a view of the New York Range and with the understanding that the school will be there. The proposed land swap and altered map with approximately 200 units all together on the western side of the property will obstruct that view and decrease property values. This will leave a very bad impression of the Town of Eagle that developers can just chop and change their developments once they've been approved. It sets a bad precedent and is clearly against TOE Code Section 4.11.050.
- We understand that the Town spent a great deal of time, careful deliberation to determine the placement of the school, ultimately deciding on its original location due to the possibility of shared facilities and resources with the proposed Mountain Rec expansion. With so much deliberation and careful consideration on the location I do not understand why a developer would suddenly want the swap. The current location will be a benefit to the children who attend the school—and their families.
- The proposed swap goes against much of what is outlined in the Elevate Eagle Master Plan (EEMP):
 - Goal 1-1.1: ensure a healthy mix of housing types and densities to allow for greater diversity. This swap does not ensure a healthy mix of housing types—it takes the previously approved configuration of a healthy mix of housing types and completely upends it. By moving all the multi-family units to one section, the swap will not remotely achieve this goal.
 - Goal 2-1.1 is that new development, additions, and renovations should aim to mimic the scale, architectural style, and character of existing and surrounding historic buildings. This proposed swap does not even come close to hitting the target.
 - The proposed swap will have eight buildings of 24 units each, all within close proximity. This is high density--EEMP indicates that High Density neighborhoods should be located near commercial centers and major corridors.
 - Goal 2-8.1 is to Support and preserve the attributes and quality of the “county lane” experience along Brush Creek Road. Placing a high-density multi-family housing section is not supporting nor preserving the “country lane” feel of Brush Creek Road.
 - Goal 3-4.2 is to maintain existing public land boundaries unless the public benefits realized by a land trade or exchange clearly outweigh any negative impacts. The proposed swap only benefits the developer and clearly does not benefit the public. In fact, the proposed swap is a detriment to the community at large: the lack of shared spaces between Mountain Rec and the future school will decrease the ability of the Town's ability to hold tournaments (which would clearly bring in much-needed revenue to the community).
- This proposed land swap will negatively impact the entire town, but mostly the children. The opportunity to have shared facilities—shared land, shared fields, and to be within walking distance of a community center—is a phenomenal one. Making this swap and moving the school would defeat the opportunity in one fell swoop.
- Mr. Cohen has stated that he wants to do the swap because it will save him money as well as earn him money with the sale of multiple units. I do not believe that a developer's budget mismanagement or profit is even remotely a decent reason to make this land swap.

- Part of Mr. Cohen’s budgetary issues comes from the fact he put the infrastructure in the wrong spot—it is not near where the high-density buildings are planned to go. This mismanagement is deeply concerning for the long-term viability of the project. Why didn’t he put the infrastructure where it needed it be? The infrastructure work has been going for two years—if it takes them this long to do this horizontal construction, how long will it take to finish this development?
- I have lost all confidence in their ability to schedule and manage this development properly given that they are constantly digging up places they’ve already dug up before to replace piping. Furthermore, they want to propose a swap without having any actual design or understanding of the costs involved.
- On Friday, 10/23, residents of the Soleil Neighborhood *finally* got a meeting with Mr. Cohen to see the renderings and ask him questions.
 - In this meeting, Mr. Cohen showed us renderings. All the multi-family housing is in one spot, making it look a lot like the River Run and Kayak Crossing developments in Eagle-Vail. This does not follow any design or development currently in Eagle now and would not fit in with the surroundings—especially in Eagle Ranch.
 - The renderings also showed that each building has 24 two-bedroom apartments, but only 20 parking spots. If 48 people live there, where are all the cars going to go?
 - This multifamily housing does not have any kind of public transportation anywhere near it, which is a significant issue considering that there isn’t enough parking.
 - The pricing of these units is (we are led to believe) around \$400,000 for a one- or two-bedroom unit. A starting salary for an Eagle County School teacher is \$37,000. Just how is the workforce housing supposed to benefit a teacher with that ratio of income to house price?

To be clear, I am not opposed to the Haymeadow development as is stands. I welcome new neighbors and the vitality it will bring to the Town. I am opposed to the land swap and all that it entails.

There are so many reasons to keep the plan as it is, but as far as we can tell, the only reason to move forward with the land swap is to benefit the developer. That’s not the way we do things in the Town of Eagle. For the reasons listed above, and others, I am adamantly opposed to the proposed land swap at the Haymeadow development.

Sincerely,

Lizzy Owens
49 Soleil Circle

From: [Gary Scanlon](#)
To: [Angieyle; Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Haymeadow PUD Amendment
Date: Tuesday, February 23, 2021 2:30:24 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Angie and Jessica,

I am writing in opposition to the Haymeadow PUD Amendment. Please forward this email to the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Town Trustees.

In the original Haymeadow PUD proposal, the developer noted that a key feature of Haymeadow is:

“A significant dedication of land for park expansion and a K-8 public school site adjacent to the existing pool and ice arena that will create a tremendous regional park and school site for the entire community”

When the project was first proposed, the Developer, the School District, Mountain Recreation, and the Town all agreed on the best location for the park and school.

It seems obvious that the Developer is now requesting a land swap in order to accelerate his profit into the first phase of the site. There are rumors that the developer wants to make a quick buck now and may then elect to abandon plans to develop the rest of the project.

Although we all hope that the Haymeadow project gets built out as proposed, we must consider the likelihood that the Developer may never construct infrastructure to serve the proposed school site in Area C and may never construct the required traffic improvements. Before considering the land swap, the Town must require that the infrastructure to the proposed school site in Area C is installed now and that the Brush Creek Road Extension is constructed now.

We trust that our Town officials are not going to be fooled into trading a developed parcel of land in the preferred location for an undeveloped parcel in the wrong location.

Thank you,

Gary Scanlon

From: [Shannon Sokup](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Hay meadow land swap
Date: uesday, February 23, 2021 5:2 :0 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Jessica,

I oppose the land swap proposed by the HayMeadow developers.

It was not the original plan and the number of housing units in such a close proximity to EPIR would adversely affect the area.

Thank you for your consideration.

Shannon Sokup

From: [Doris Kirchner](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Haymeadow P amendment
Date: Wednesday, February 24, 2021 1:55:05 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Jessica,

I appreciate the time spent on the phone with you today regarding concerns related to traffic on Ouzel Lane, Eagle Ranch Road, Sylvan Lake Road and Brush Creek Road with the further development of the Haymeadow project and the relocation of the school site as described in the PUD Amendment.

Concerns:

- 1) When will a traffic impact study be done on Haymeadow, Ouzel Lane and **Eagle Ranch Road**? With the relocation of the school as proposed in the PUD Amendment, the tie in to Ouzel Lane lends to additional traffic on Eagle Ranch Road which is a 2 lane road running through a residential neighborhood with driveways opening to the street, multiple golf course crossings, many children and pets. In my opinion increased traffic is a safety issue that should be acknowledged and planned for ahead of the school project. Waiting for a time in the future to do the traffic study is faulty to the planning process.
- 2) What is the opportunity for a round about to be located at Ouzel and Brush Creek Road? I understand that Brush Creek Road is owned by Eagle County. Is this being considered? Timing of such a project prior to the construction of the school may be important.
- 3) Given the additional traffic impact with the Haymeadow project, when will the building of the Bull Pasture Bypass be achieved? In my opinion having the Bypass will lend to better traffic flow from the Haymeadow project to the main part of the Town and Hwy 6..

Thank you for discussing these concerns.

Sincerely,

Doris Kirchner

From: [Lucila](#)
To: [Jessica Lake](#)
Subject: Stop the Haymeadow swap
Date: ednesday, February 24, 2021 11:24:02 M

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Please don't allow another developer to take advantage of out town . This swap should not be allowed, please stick to the original plan .

To me, it sounds like the developer needs the swap for his own benefit (obviously). There's a reason why that land was assigned in the original plan , let's not change it just because the developer run out of money .

Thanks!

Lucila Tvarkunas

Sent from my iPhone

2.23.2021

Eagle Town Council & Planning & Zoning Commission

Delivered via email to: Town Clerk clerk@townofeagle.org

RE: Haymeadow PUD Amendment Application

Dear Mayor and Town Council,

I'm writing to show my support for Haymeadow and the amendments that the developer is proposing to the Haymeadow PUD.

I have been interested in and following the Haymeadow project for some time now. I like the location and everything that living in Eagle has to offer. I currently have housing, but am anxiously awaiting the construction and sale of units in Haymeadow so that I can purchase a home and move to Eagle.

I've met with the development team and understand that the primary focus of their amendment is trading Eagle County School District land in Neighborhood B (18 acres) for land dedicated to the District in Neighborhood A (14 acres) in order to build 112 already approved housing units sooner. This makes sense to me given the lack of housing available in the area. Waiting years to build the same units doesn't solve immediate housing needs. While I can patiently wait for my opportunity to own in Haymeadow, many can't.

As a professional photographer I can also see the demand for an additional high quality space to host weddings and events. The cabin renovation plan also makes sense and should be supported.

Please approve the Haymeadow PUD amendment application. Why wait for something we need now.

Thank you,

Scott Bellow
Edwards, CO



This petition has collected
127 signatures
using the online tools at www.ipetitions.com

Printed on 2021-02-25

Stop the Haymeadow Swap!

About this petition

We, the undersigned, vehemently oppose the planned site swap proposed by the Haymeadow Developer. The Developer proposes taking the current school site and swapping it with one close to a mile away. In the original school site, the Developer would like to build approximately 200 multi-family units that are three-stories tall.

The Developer would like this swap to happen because the infrastructure that is currently in place does not reach where the multi-family units need would be, and he will build the inexpensive units to sell them to fund the next stage of the development.

The original site was chosen for the school to decrease traffic and to share facilities and fields with the Town of Eagle and Mountain Rec. The school kids would be able to have walkable access to fields, bike trails, playgrounds, skating rinks, skate parks, and more. By moving the school a mile away, this all but eliminates the possibility for Eagle's children to benefit from the Town's vision. Additionally, by having the school in its planned location, the Town of Eagle will be able to host even more bike and hockey tournaments, thus bringing in significant revenue.

In the original school site, these multi-family units will not conform to the Elevate Eagle plans in a variety of ways (density, look, feel, location relative to I-70 and business and bus lines, intention), including offering enough parking. They are claimed to be workforce housing, but there is not a single bus route that goes through Eagle Ranch.

The only reason that the Developer is proposing this swap is because of his mismanagement of the construction process and his inability to oversee a construction project of this magnitude. The only person who benefits from the swap is the Developer--not the people of Eagle.

Signatures

1. Name: Brian Bishop on 2021-02-12 18:05:17
Comments: Absolutely not... this will impact our home value as soon as it's put in place.

2. Name: RIC TURMEL on 2021-02-12 18:11:46
Comments: The developer's error/lack of resources should not be assisted by the government.

3. Name: Michael Kleinman on 2021-02-12 18:37:55
Comments:

4. Name: Lizzy Owens on 2021-02-12 18:42:27
Comments:

5. Name: Eamonn Rooney on 2021-02-12 19:08:53
Comments:

6. Name: Matt Owens on 2021-02-12 19:11:43
Comments:

7. Name: Ann E Wahouske on 2021-02-12 20:05:51
Comments:

8. Name: James Van Hekken on 2021-02-12 22:00:21
Comments:

9. Name: Stacy stidger on 2021-02-12 22:14:06
Comments:

10. Name: Amy Gomez on 2021-02-12 22:42:09
Comments:

11. Name: Peter Leibig on 2021-02-12 22:55:16
Comments: Stop the Swap!

12. Name: Laura Howe on 2021-02-12 23:10:00
Comments: I vehemently oppose the Haymeadow Swap.

13. Name: Elizabeth Ronzio on 2021-02-13 02:53:33
Comments:

14. Name: Janice Tonz on 2021-02-13 15:06:34
Comments: I live in Brush Creek Village and oppose this swap for multiple reasons, including the following: negatively effect on property values; traffic congestion on Brush Creek; benefits only the developer, who should follow the original PUD; sets a precedent for future developers to try to bypass the original PUD.
-
15. Name: Linda McLaughlin on 2021-02-13 18:30:33
Comments: Please don't allow the swap to take place. The best plan is already in place.
-
16. Name: Dave Gerdes on 2021-02-13 18:54:36
Comments: The developer has failed to plan and communicate. There does not appear to be a good reason for this change that benefits anyone but the developer. Take a look at the status updates on Haymeadow.com to see the developers total lack of communication to the community.
-
17. Name: Tim Ryan on 2021-02-13 21:30:25
Comments:
-
18. Name: John and Karen Field on 2021-02-13 22:43:12
Comments: Block views, Properties Value, congestion
-
19. Name: Holly Nielsen on 2021-02-13 23:09:32
Comments:
-
20. Name: Katherine Johnson on 2021-02-15 15:38:01
Comments:
-
21. Name: Lizzie Lenox on 2021-02-15 18:30:49
Comments:
-
22. Name: Debra S Dieter on 2021-02-22 00:29:43
Comments:
-
23. Name: David Dieter on 2021-02-22 00:30:32
Comments:
-
24. Name: Julia Parker on 2021-02-22 16:30:31
Comments: No swap. The project as a whole does not seem very well planned to meld with our Eagle Community. Changing what was already controversial approval of development does not make sense. Any way to re-write the whole script out there and use the Colby place as an example and create ranchettes. Just thinking out loud.
-
25. Name: Angie Kriedeman on 2021-02-22 17:39:45
Comments:

-
26. Name: James Suhadolink on 2021-02-22 17:40:36
Comments:
-
27. Name: Lori Tarpey on 2021-02-22 17:44:09
Comments:
-
28. Name: Gregory Meister on 2021-02-22 17:51:59
Comments: The developer needs to stick to the original plan, that was agreed to.
-
29. Name: David Blum on 2021-02-22 17:52:35
Comments:
-
30. Name: Beth Morrison on 2021-02-22 17:53:16
Comments:
-
31. Name: LaRae Keyes on 2021-02-22 18:03:48
Comments:
-
32. Name: Sheryl Staten on 2021-02-22 18:04:59
Comments:
-
33. Name: Devra DiDomenico on 2021-02-22 18:07:27
Comments:
-
34. Name: Kim Bradley on 2021-02-22 18:37:28
Comments: I oppose due to the time and planning involved with the original approval of the school site and the vision to share amenities between the recreation and school districts. Shared amenities is the best use of our tax dollars!
-
35. Name: Samantha Young on 2021-02-22 18:56:28
Comments:
-
36. Name: Megan Saul on 2021-02-22 19:10:22
Comments:
-
37. Name: Linda Bennett on 2021-02-22 19:17:33
Comments:
-
38. Name: Mike Claymon on 2021-02-22 19:20:20
Comments:
-

39. Name: Alison Everett on 2021-02-22 19:53:44
Comments:
-
40. Name: Angela Sommer on 2021-02-22 20:04:18
Comments:
-
41. Name: Beth Ryan on 2021-02-22 20:04:58
Comments:
-
42. Name: Aubrey Tinsley on 2021-02-22 20:08:26
Comments:
-
43. Name: Courtney Moore on 2021-02-22 20:29:44
Comments:
-
44. Name: Kim Anderson on 2021-02-22 20:30:34
Comments:
-
45. Name: Jon Walters on 2021-02-22 20:31:08
Comments: I strongly disagree with the proposed changes the developer is requesting. The new plan is a huge deviation from the proposed plan and will negatively effect the community in a number of ways. They should be forced to stay with their current plan.
-
46. Name: Aly Anderson on 2021-02-22 20:33:27
Comments:
-
47. Name: Amy May on 2021-02-22 20:33:54
Comments:
-
48. Name: Jason Anderson on 2021-02-22 20:44:12
Comments:
-
49. Name: Martha Teien on 2021-02-22 20:53:12
Comments:
-
50. Name: Robert Clasen on 2021-02-22 21:08:00
Comments: Original plan is sensible and more beneficial to the community
-
51. Name: Kelly Karli on 2021-02-22 21:20:23
Comments: The change only benefits the developer not the locals that live in the community. DO NOT SWAP!
-

52. Name: jerome keyes on 2021-02-22 21:35:07
Comments:
-
53. Name: Matt Marple on 2021-02-22 21:53:17
Comments:
-
54. Name: Bethanie Lindal on 2021-02-22 22:05:21
Comments: Completely against this development
-
55. Name: Lauren Bumgarner on 2021-02-22 22:13:51
Comments: The proposed swap does not serve those already living in the community and would also cause significant traffic congestion along Ouzel and Eagle Ranch.
-
56. Name: Natalie Rooney on 2021-02-22 22:44:40
Comments: We need to stop pandering to developers and hold them accountable.
-
57. Name: Carol Carlson on 2021-02-22 22:47:07
Comments:
-
58. Name: William Lott on 2021-02-22 23:05:45
Comments:
-
59. Name: Amy Goldman on 2021-02-22 23:07:52
Comments:
-
60. Name: Renee Wagner on 2021-02-22 23:17:46
Comments: Stop the Swap! I agree with Julia Parker's comment
-
61. Name: Amy Gornikiewicz on 2021-02-22 23:45:50
Comments: What more needs to be said than : The only person who benefits from the swap is the Developer--not the people of Eagle. This does not benefit Eagle.
-
62. Name: Anne Scott on 2021-02-23 00:25:38
Comments:
-
63. Name: Carole Bukovich on 2021-02-23 01:12:46
Comments:
-
64. Name: Jennifer Boggs on 2021-02-23 02:07:40
Comments: The town has made enough concessions to the Haymeadow development already. The swap should not occur.
-

65.	Name: Shannon Dodds	on 2021-02-23 02:29:40	Comments:
66.	Name: Katherine Tyler	on 2021-02-23 02:36:50	Comments:
67.	Name: Bruce Keyes	on 2021-02-23 02:45:46	Comments:
68.	Name: Becky wydra	on 2021-02-23 03:11:40	Comments:
69.	Name: Heather Uzdavinis	on 2021-02-23 03:26:48	Comments:
70.	Name: Rebecca Steffen	on 2021-02-23 03:34:43	Comments:
71.	Name: Carrie Cossette	on 2021-02-23 03:34:49	Comments:
72.	Name: Jennifer Mahaffey	on 2021-02-23 04:32:09	Comments:
73.	Name: Danielle Miller	on 2021-02-23 05:02:49	Comments:
74.	Name: Rebecca Lewandowski	on 2021-02-23 05:48:36	Comments:
75.	Name: Ann Cathcart	on 2021-02-23 15:27:56	Comments:
76.	Name: Shannon Corbin	on 2021-02-23 17:36:30	Comments:
77.	Name: Kristen Green	on 2021-02-23 17:54:32	Comments: The Elevate Eagle plans were created with input from so many constituents and should not be disregarded for one constituent.
78.	Name: Tyra Rudrud	on 2021-02-23 18:36:33	Comments:

-
79. Name: Andrew Broderick on 2021-02-23 19:20:03
Comments:
-
80. Name: Sarah Heredia on 2021-02-23 19:57:37
Comments:
-
81. Name: Susan Baran on 2021-02-23 22:01:00
Comments:
-
82. Name: Jeffrey K Baran on 2021-02-23 23:38:32
Comments: I strongly oppose the landswap. I purchased a home in the Soleil subdivision knowing that a future school would be in the approved location. This is nothing more than a desire by the developer to save money as their original plans were poorly conceived and require additional infrastructure at the early stage of the project. No one other than the developer benefits from the proposal.
-
83. Name: Carling bennett on 2021-02-24 01:33:51
Comments:
-
84. Name: Kelly Reseigh on 2021-02-24 04:12:41
Comments:
-
85. Name: Michael Kleinman on 2021-02-24 18:01:17
Comments: This is a terrible proposal that only benefits the developers
-
86. Name: Gina Van Hekken on 2021-02-24 18:03:49
Comments:
-
87. Name: Shelly mello on 2021-02-24 18:18:27
Comments:
-
88. Name: Becca on 2021-02-24 18:39:02
Comments:
-
89. Name: John Hayward on 2021-02-24 18:51:26
Comments: Thanks Mike
-
90. Name: Todd C Beckum on 2021-02-24 19:39:42
Comments: No to the swap!!
-
91. Name: Dustin Hall on 2021-02-24 20:30:14

Comments:

-
92. Name: Barb Wendell on 2021-02-24 20:35:50
Comments: Put Eagle, our schools, trails, and facilities first over developer interests.
-
93. Name: Anne Scott on 2021-02-24 22:01:51
Comments:
-
94. Name: Patrick Hasselbach on 2021-02-24 22:38:51
Comments: The proximity of the school to the rec center was an important part of this plan.
-
95. Name: Neal Henzler on 2021-02-24 22:50:56
Comments:
-
96. Name: Jena on 2021-02-24 22:59:31
Comments:
-
97. Name: Lindsay Crowder on 2021-02-25 00:21:08
Comments:
-
98. Name: Sarah Janssen on 2021-02-25 00:24:09
Comments:
-
99. Name: Amy Kinser on 2021-02-25 00:24:45
Comments: I oppose this terrible development and land swap. The school needs to be next to the rec center as originally planned.
-
100. Name: Clint Janssen on 2021-02-25 00:25:10
Comments:
-
101. Name: Melissa Reec on 2021-02-25 00:35:08
Comments:
-
102. Name: DeDe Dickinson on 2021-02-25 02:07:12
Comments: This should never have gotten approved in the first place when it's taken Eagle Ranch so long to reach build out and agreeing to the land swap is just one more big mistake!
-
103. Name: Leisa Wood on 2021-02-25 02:10:14
Comments:
-

104. Name: Jean Hoover on 2021-02-25 02:14:13
Comments:
-
105. Name: Elisa Willoughby on 2021-02-25 02:21:21
Comments: Stop please
-
106. Name: Kent Jordan on 2021-02-25 02:40:23
Comments: That area was ear marked more than a decade ago. For Recreation and School so they could share facilities! The developers are just in for greed! Traffic is bad now, don't cram more to that area!
-
107. Name: Randy Redding on 2021-02-25 03:31:12
Comments:
-
108. Name: Rachel Smiley on 2021-02-25 04:43:41
Comments:
-
109. Name: Jan Townsend on 2021-02-25 07:29:56
Comments: Stop this please! This is just wrong.
-
110. Name: Jay Townsend on 2021-02-25 07:31:31
Comments: This is nuts! Stop this swap. No more concessions m!
-
111. Name: Darcy Buster on 2021-02-25 09:13:12
Comments: I hope this gets stopped! I live in Edwards & I'm against the proposed Hive & Riverpark developments. All in the name of helping the housing crisis, at the expense of losing the character & charm of these areas. Pleading to our county to not allow these gross deviations from our original plan.
-
112. Name: Teresa Taylor on 2021-02-25 13:46:42
Comments:
-
113. Name: James Dilzell on 2021-02-25 14:45:41
Comments: This change in plans is not the diverse community we were promised, and is a change that doesn't benefit the town but only the developer. Town of Eagle, please do not approve this change! Continue as planned and put a school where the school was supposed to be!
-
114. Name: Mary Wolf on 2021-02-25 14:46:59
Comments:
-
115. Name: Susan Ballard on 2021-02-25 15:25:25
Comments:

-
116. Name: Linda Pankuch on 2021-02-25 15:46:25
Comments: Totally against
-
117. Name: Hannah Irwin on 2021-02-25 16:51:49
Comments: Let's do what's best for the entire community!
-
118. Name: Dane Bennett on 2021-02-25 18:05:47
Comments:
-
119. Name: Caroline Hall on 2021-02-25 18:08:35
Comments:
-
120. Name: Sue Nikolai on 2021-02-25 19:05:45
Comments: This does not fit in with the original development plan and negates all the advantages of that original plan. Please don't allow this to go through.
-
121. Name: Michelle Applegate on 2021-02-25 19:30:00
Comments:
-
122. Name: Kristin Brown on 2021-02-25 19:40:42
Comments:
-
123. Name: Lauren Shively on 2021-02-25 19:59:14
Comments:
-
124. Name: Megan on 2021-02-25 20:56:37
Comments:
-
125. Name: Maat on 2021-02-25 21:33:22
Comments:
-
126. Name: Tessa Allen on 2021-02-25 21:44:50
Comments:
-
127. Name: Nick Everett on 2021-02-25 21:50:51
Comments: stop this!
-



TOWN OF EAGLE REFERRAL RESPONSES NEEDING FURTHER ACTION REPORT

ISSUED: February 25, 2020

Project Name: PUDA20-01 Haymeadow PUD Amendment
Owner/Applicant: Rick Pylman, Brandon Cohen, Scott Schlosser
Prepared by: Dennis C Wike-PE, Town Engineer

The Town of Eagle Public Works Department is issuing the following Response Summary Report of Items Needing Further Action. If you have any questions or concerns regarding any comment, contact me or the individual agency to clarify the statement and reach an understanding. Please include the Town's Public Works & Community Development contacts on all correspondence.

REFERRAL COMMENTS SECTION

Community Development – Jessica Lake: jessica.lake@townofeagle.org
Engineering/Public Works – Dennis Wike: dennis.wike@townofeagle.org

1. TRAFFIC-SCHOOL SITE & NEAR-BY: Traffic memo states: “the configuration of Brush Creek Road and Ouzel Lane intersection should be studied prior to the time of Final Plat.” - This is problematic. We will need at least a preliminary analysis now, so that Council can make a more informed decision. This is potentially an area of concern for the Town, County and public to push off for a later phase.
2. TRAFFIC-INTERNAL & NEAR-BY: The original traffic study and the traffic memo should be updated to reflect the current predictions for comparing internal pedestrian, bicycle, vehicle, and bus trips between the existing and proposed relocated school site. The traffic analysis should account for drop-offs and pickups within the Haymeadow development including Level of Service impacts at the school site(s) and key intersections.
3. PUD/ADA: With the proposed increase of density in the initial Filing the site roundabout completion will likely need to accelerated. Review prior documentation and resubmit with required revisions needed to construction schedule to maintain expected Levels of Service.
4. PUD/ADA: Submit a Joint Excavation Plan to comply with the Towns recently passed Joint Excavation ordinance identifying steps taken to install conduits & their dedication for future broadband utilities planning to serve the development.



5. PUD: Re-model all utilities, especially water service, for the proposed increase in density within Filing 1 due to changes in uses, location, building type, & number of stories. Submit documentation showing existing utilities in Filing 1 can support proposed changes within Filing 1 and highlight any required changes to meet existing requirements.
6. PUD: Submit documentation detailing potable water and non-potable water changes in use, quantity, pressure, etc expected from the proposed use changes, especially for irrigation waters. Documentation will be reviewed by TOE subject matter experts.
7. PUD: Document age of all reports referenced in this document, discuss what assumptions of these studies are no longer accurate, if new data is available, and if any are reports need to be updated to be relied upon.
8. PUD: Expand Water & Wastewater paragraph to capture all above analysis and reviews as it is presently inadequate.
9. PUD: Add language about timing/commitment for providing services and infrastructure necessary to complete the school on the relocated tract to meet the School District's Plans similar to the language for the Fire Station tract.