

## Neighborhood Meeting Summary

**Application:** Bella Mesa North Site Development Plan

**Property Owner:** Fourth Investment USA LLC

**Meeting #:** 1

**Date/Time:** Monday, December 4, 2024, 6:00p.m. (Adjourned at 7:18p.m.)

**Meeting Location:** Cantril School

**Councilmember District:** Councilmember Brooks

### Applicant's Proposal:

The applicant Cardel Homes, is proposing a residential neighborhood consisting of 525 single-family homes. The property is located northeast of the intersection of Mitchell Street and Mikelson Boulevard.

### Attendees

#### Applicant Representatives:

Josie O'Connor, Redland

Evan Rumney, Redland

Sara Dieringer, Cardel Homes

Bryan Conway, Cardel Homes

Mike Newman, Cardel Homes

Scott Kilgore, Fox Tuttle

#### Public Attendees:

*16 In-person Attendee:*

*9 Online/Phone Attendees*

#### Town Staff Attendees:

BrieAnna Simon, Senior Planner, Town of Castle Rock

### Presentation Description

#### Applicant's Presentation:

The applicant gave a summary of the proposed site development plan and review process. The applicant provided a presentation showing the proposed design of the site including proposed access connections, open space, and park locations. The applicant outlined the required and proposed buffers across the site.

### Questions Presented to Applicant:

*Q: Wildlife, include birds, mountain lions, bears and elk have been seen on this property. What ecological studies have taken place for this property? When did these studies take place?*

A: The applicant stated that as part of the Site Development Plan submittal a Land Suitability Analysis is required. Part of this analysis is an ecological study. The study completed did not find any endangered species. These studies were generally completed during the daytime hours.

*Q: Is two points of access acceptable for the number of homes proposed?*

A: The applicant stated a Traffic Impact Analysis was completed at time of zoning, which reviewed the number of allowed units and potential traffic circulation. The zoning anticipated these two access points. Additionally, a Traffic Impact Analysis has been completed for this project. This analysis has looked at the circulation internally to the site and off-site improvements, such as the roundabout at Michelson and North Mitchell Street, needed to accommodate the anticipated number of homes.

*Q: Did the Traffic Impact Analysis evaluate a mandatory evacuation in the event of a fire?*

A: The applicant stated the Traffic Impact Analysis evaluates the average day traffic during peak times. This application will go through the Town's review process and be required to meet the Town's safety regulations as it relates to fire.

*Q: Did the Traffic Impact Analysis evaluate the average daily traffic during construction?*

A: The applicant stated the Traffic Impact Analysis evaluates the average day traffic at final build out of the project. The average daily traffic will be less during the construction phase compared to final build out. The applicant will work with the Town to ensure construction traffic is managed properly.

*Q: Does the Town or the Developer complete the Traffic Impact Analysis?*

A: The applicant stated the developer creates the Traffic Impact Analysis in accordance with the Town's regulations, which is then reviewed by the Town.

*Q: Does the Traffic Impact Analysis take into consideration the neighborhood schools and school traffic?*

A: The applicant stated the Traffic Impact Analysis does evaluate peak school times. The developer intends to work with the Town and the neighboring school to ensure traffic circulates properly.

*Q: Will the existing Mitchell Street connection be removed?*

A: The applicant explained the existing Mitchell Street connection was previously designed and built as a temporary roadway. The roadway today does not meet the Town's standards. The proposed plan relocates this connection through a new roundabout within the project area.

*Q: Will the existing Mitchell Street connection be open during construction?*

A: The applicant stated the existing Mitchell Street connection will remain in place until such time the new roadway connection is completed.

*Q: Is there an opportunity to make the Mitchell Street connection permanent?*

A: The applicant stated they would work with the Town to determine if the Mitchell Street connection could remain in place or if this connection needs to be relocated.

*Q: What is the estimated price value of the homes?*

A: The applicant stated the values have not been determined at this time. However, it is estimated these homes to start in the \$800,000.

*Q: What is the estimated size of these homes and how many stories tall will these homes be?*

A: The applicant stated the exact sizes of these homes have not been determined at this time. However, it is estimated these homes will range from 1,900 square feet to 3,500 square feet. The homes will vary between ranch and two-story buildings.

*Q: Will homes along the cliff edge be required to be one-story similar to the existing surrounding development?*

A: The applicant stated this has not been determined at this time.

*Q: What are the lot sizes of these homes?*

A: The applicant stated these lots will range between 50 and 60 foot wide lots.

*Q: Has the applicant considered reducing the number of homes and increasing the lot sizes?*

A: The applicant stated they have not considered reducing the number of lots at this time. The applicant is looking to move forward with the general lot layout and plans that have been through previous reviews with the Town.

*Q: What is the estimated construction timeframe? What is the estimated timeframe of construction of homes closest to the projects southern property line?*

A: The applicant stated the plan is to build the homes closest to the southern property line first. The project is estimated to take at least three years to fully build out.

*Q: The proposed homes adjacent to the projects southern property line do not appear to match the look of the adjacent development? Would like to see this area be a true like-for-like match between the two developments.*

A: The applicant stated the Planned Development Plan requires the two developments to match dwelling units per acre in this area.

*Q: Will blasting occur on this site for the proposed development?*

A: The applicant stated blasting will be required for this project. However, no blasting will occur within 300 feet of an existing structure. The applicant will follow all the blasting requirement set by the Town.

*Q: What is the plan for drainage on this site? How will the newly constructed pond by the school be incorporated into this development?*

A: The applicant stated as part of this project they will be required to meet the Town's regulations for grading on site. The pond by the school currently drains into this project area. The proposed project will capture this drainage within the drainage plan provided with this application. Additional drainage infrastructure will be required as part of this development.

*Q: The existing homes sit lower than the proposed development. Will drainage be addressed between the existing homes and the proposed development?*

A: The applicant stated as part of this project they will be required to meet the Town's regulations for grading on site.

*Q: Where will the applicant be obtaining water for this project and the number of proposed homes?*

A: The applicant stated water was dedicated as part of the annexation. The applicant plans on purchasing additional water from the Town to cover water deficit.

*Q: Residents had the following comments pertaining to the project.*

- Residents would like to see larger lot sizes on this property.
- Residents would like to see a larger buffer along the southern property line of this project between Mitchell Street and Mitchell Street.
- Residents would like to see the homes removed in the entire area south of the proposed roundabout at Mitchell Street and Mitchell Street and dedicated as open space.
- The climate and nature of Castle Rock has changed since the zoning on this property was approved and does not stick with the character of this area any more.
- Residents would not like to see trails directly along the cliff edge looking down into existing residential properties.
- Residents are concerned with trash and debris during construction.
- Residents are concerned with dust during construction.

## Neighborhood Meeting Summary

**Application:** Bella Mesa North Site Development Plan

**Property Owner:** Fourth Investment USA LLC

**Meeting #:** 2

**Date/Time:** Monday, February 24, 2025 (Adjourned at 7:30p.m.)

**Meeting Location:** Cantril School

**Councilmember District:** Councilmember Brooks

### Applicant's Proposal:

The applicant Cardel Homes, is proposing a residential neighborhood consisting of 525 single-family homes. The property is located northeast of the intersection of Mitchell Street and Mikelson Boulevard.

### Attendees

#### Applicant Representatives:

Josie O'Connor, Redland

Evan Rumney, Redland

Allison Stavish, Redland

Sara Dieringer, Cardel Homes

Bryan Conway, Cardel Homes

Mike Newman, Cardel Homes

Scott Kilgore, Fox Tuttle

#### Public Attendees:

*13 In-person Attendee:*

*15 Online/Phone Attendees*

#### Town Staff Attendees:

BrieAnna Simon, Senior Planner, Town of Castle Rock

### Presentation Description

#### Applicant's Presentation:

The applicant gave a summary of the proposed site development plan and review process. The applicant provided a presentation showing the proposed design of the site including proposed access connections, open space, and park locations. The applicant outlined changes that have been made to the plan since the first neighborhood meeting and why other changes could not be accommodated.

### Questions Presented to Applicant:

*Q: Current school traffic in this area is horrible and cause concern for safety. Was school traffic taken into consideration when the traffic counts were collected?*

A: The applicant stated school was in session when traffic counts were collected for this project.

*Q: Will there be any height restrictions for the homes along the eastern or southern boundary of this project?*

A: The applicant stated there are no height restrictions in the Planned Development Plan for this property. A 250 foot buffer was required in the Planned Development Plan to accommodate a view corridor for the east side of the development. All lots within the proposed development will consist of 1 or 2 story homes.

*Q: Will there be any light restrictions on the development?*

A: The applicant stated lighting provided on site will be full-cut off fixtures to eliminate side glare. The exact lighting of the site will be determined at the next phase in the Construction Drawings.

*Q: What Urban Wildfire Mitigation has occurred with this project?*

A: The applicant stated they are currently working the Town of Castle Rock Fire Department to ensure all urban wildfire mitigation regulations and standards have been met. This project will not be scheduled for public hearing until Town of Castle Rock Fire Department has signed off on the plans.

*Q: Will the proposed development have a separate HOA?*

A: The applicant stated this development will have a separate HOA and be part of the Bella Mesa Metropolitan District.

*Q: Has any consideration for 5-10 acre lots in this area been considered?*

A: The applicant stated they have not considered larger lots with less homes. The expectation from the landowner, metropolitan district and developer is for the full 525 lots.

*Q: This process is wrong. There needs to be more Town representatives at these meetings besides one planner.*

A: Staff outlined the process for applicant run neighborhood meetings and upcoming public hearings.

*Q: Will any fencing or signage be provided on the property to protect Franktown residents?*

A: The applicant stated they will not be provided fencing along the eastern edge in order to avoid limiting wildlife movement throughout the site. The applicant stated they have moved the trail locations further into the site and away from the eastern boundary.

*Q: Where will the trailhead parking be located on the site? Will there be signage to ensure the public parks at the trailhead and not within the adjacent developments?*

A: The applicant stated there is parking at the central park in the development. They will also be adding a trailhead parking lot further within the development. The applicant stated they are coordinating this location with the Town.

*Q: Why is all of the open space being included in the density calculation? This is a misrepresentation.*

A: The applicant stated they will bring the net density excluding the open space calculation to the next neighborhood meeting.

*Q: Will the new roadway be completed prior to removing the temporary Mitchell Street connection?*

A: The applicant stated, yes the new connection will be completed prior to removing the temporary road.

*Q: Will the new sidewalk connection where the existing temporary road connection is be complete prior to removing the existing sidewalk connection?*

A: The applicant stated this phasing has not been determined at this time.

*Q: Will trails be restricted to only hikers or mountain bikers?*

A: The applicant stated the 3 foot dirt trails meet the Town's standards for trails. All trails will be coordinated with the Town.

*Q: Who will maintain the landscaping and trails?*

A: The applicant stated maintenance will be a metropolitan district or HOA obligation.

*Q: What protection will existing residents to the south be given for no trespassing?*

A: The applicant stated they will look into this.

*Q: The homes on the southern boundary do not match the existing development to the south. Will the density be reduced in this area?*

A: The applicant stated this area has been evaluated and they have removed two lots since the first neighborhood meeting.

*Q: Where will the detention ponds on site be located? Will any run off be directed to the existing development to the south?*

A: The applicant identified where each proposed detention pond on site will be located. The applicant also stated no run off will be directed south off-site.

*Q: Will the homes in this development have basements?*

A: The applicant stated some of the homes will have basement but they will be site specific based on soils.

*Q: How will the developer mitigate blasting and shock waves, along with impact to adjacent developments?*

A: The applicant stated they will follow the Town's blasting requirements, also surveys before and after will be taken to ensure no impact.

*Q: Residents had the following comments pertaining to the project.*

- Residents are concerned with the impact 500+ homes will have on the existing wildlife and food availability for wildlife.
- Residents would like the Mitchell Gulch corridor protected and homes moved further away to allow for wildlife movement.
- Residents would like the northern lots removed to allow for a larger buffer for the wildlife.
- Residents would like the outdoor classrooms removed or moved internal to the site in order to avoid natural areas becoming a playground.
- Residents would like to see the trail spur on the northern end of the property removed.
- Residents would like to see a secondary parallel soft surface trail adjacent to the paved trail on the southern boundary where the existing temporary road is located.
- Residents are concerned about fire mitigation. How the additional homes will limit existing residents' ability to evacuate. Along with a fire evacuation as it relates to the school and special events.
- Neighboring residents are concerned the new development will impede their view of the Milky Way due to additional light pollution.
- Residents would like to see an additional connection to this development, such as an access road to the west over Mitchell Creek.
- Residents are concerned with the additional traffic this development will cause on Mitchell
- Residents would like to see 13 homes removed from the southern boundary.
- Some residents do not feel that concerns from the first meeting have been incorporated into the proposed plan.
- Residents would like to see the applicant be good neighbors and prioritize existing residents.
- Residents are concerned the city is not prepared with wisdom to protect existing residents.
- Existing residents do not feel they have an advocate for them.