

Memmen Young Rezoning Neighborhood Meeting  
May 21, 2019  
Rock Ridge Elementary School

*Project Team:*

Rusty Hall – Highline Engineering  
Roy Mason – Villages Development  
Clayton Trapp – Phelps Engineering

*Attendance:*

Approximately 25 to 30 residents attended.

*Current Zoning:*

Memmen Young was zoned in 1985 and encompasses a total of 206.3 acres with entitlements of 559 single-family units and 476 multi-family units totaling 1035 residential units. Post zoning approval, the Town approved the Skyline/Ridge Line Ordinance. A significant portion of the property has been identified as a major ridgeline preventing building in that area and another significant portion of the property has been identified as moderate skyline limiting buildings to 25 feet in height.

*Synopsis of the Project:*

The development team is proposing to rezone ~181 acres of the Memmen Young PD that includes entitlements for 510 single-family units and 476 multi-family units totaling 986 residential units. The purpose of the rezoning would be to shift use areas out of the major ridgeline and reestablish the entitlements for approximately 400 single family units and 300 paired home units (150 lots) totaling 700 residential units. As part of the rezoning application, the development team intends to request a variance to have approximately 15-20 lots encroach into the major ridgeline area. Some of these lots would just have their backyards encroach and the houses would be outside of the major ridgeline boundary.

*General notes:*

- 81 acres of the 186 total acres would be set aside as open space. This is approximately 45% of the property.
- While the sketch plan shows a total of 694 units, Mr. Hall indicated that as they work through the process he envisions the total number of units will ultimately fall closer to 650 units.
- During the process, the development team will engage with the Town on how the open space will be allocated (public vs private) and determine what type of trail system could be incorporated into the project.

*Questions/Issues Raised:*

- How is the height calculated?
  - Mr. Hall explained how the Town measures the height by the average finished grade to the top of the building.
  - Residents expressed concern that the effective height could be higher and impact the ridgeline and skyline.
- Will there be over lot grading of the property and could that raise the ultimate elevation of the top of the homes and impact ridgeline and skyline.
  - Mr. Hall indicated that over lot grading of the property will occur and could effectively raise the height of some homes.
  - Mr. Hall indicated that the property topography resembles a bowl with higher elevations at the edges and the property dipping down in the middle. It would be expected that they would cut from the edges to fill in the middle to balance the site.
- What would be the anticipated house size be and who would be the builders?
  - The single family homes would range from 2,4000 to 3,000 square feet.
  - The development team could not disclose who the builders would be but they indicated it could be a few different national builders
  - Residents expressed concern about the quality of architecture of the homes. Expressed that national home builders could be a good or bad thing.
  - It was asked if the development could consist of fewer larger and more expensive homes. The development team responded that the market would not support that type of product.
- Questions were raised about the traffic impact on the surrounding roads, specifically 5<sup>th</sup> Street.
  - The development team is currently commissioning a traffic study and will work with the Town and will be better able to address in future meetings.
- Questions were raised about drainage from the site, especially down to properties on Gordon Dr., S Larkspur Dr., and Santana Dr.
  - Drainage will be designed to conform to all Town and State requirements.
- Questions about the soils and rock fall dangers, especially on the north portion of the property
  - A soil study is being commissioned which will identify mitigation measures.

*Summary:*

Residents asked Mr. Hall to summarize what he had heard during the meeting. Mr. Hall indicated that there were several things brought up the development team will look to address or provide more detailed questions in future meetings but there was one overarching theme to the meeting. That theme was the impact that the development will have on the ridgeline. Specifically, the proposed western most cul-de-sac. It is not just the houses that they are asking to be allowed to encroach into the ridgeline area no build area that residents are concerned about but also the houses that are just outside of the no build zone. Residents appeared to agree with this summary.

*Next Steps:*

The development team indicated that they are still working towards a submittal to the Town. They proposed another neighborhood meeting after they receive first review comments so that they can show residents an updated plan that incorporates their comments and the Town's comments.

On Thursday February 20, 2020, Rusty Hall, the applicant for the Founders Vista held a neighborhood meeting to discuss their PDP amendment that is currently in review and their Annexation request and Site Development Plan that they anticipate submitting in the near future. This was their 2<sup>nd</sup> overall neighborhood meeting. Approximately 20 people attended the meeting. Below you will find general comments and questions that came up during the meeting. If there was a response by the development team it is in italics.

- Residents again stated they would prefer no building to occur near the ridge, even if it is not in the major ridgeline restriction area. Residents asked why some of those areas along the ridge were not included in the major ridgeline restriction area. Additionally, some residents had stated they had been told that the Town had planned or was planning on reshooting/redefining the ridgeline/skyline areas.
- Residents in the subdivision below Memmen Young (specifically around Gordon Lane and S Larkspur Dr) do not want to be able to see the houses when they look up the ridge. *The applicant said they believed that they would not be visible from those areas but obviously would be visible from other areas in Town. The applicant suggested that when the ground thawed this spring they could do some type of demonstration such as placing a flag pole at the area of concern.*
- If the 5 acre annexation does occur what would happen to the cell Tower on the property. *Applicant stated they are looking at different options including relocation of the tower but may be limited to the terms of the existing lease. At minimum they would look to replace the existing pole with something that is more visually appealing.*
- There was a concern about blasting on the site as there has been substantial blasting at the Sunstone and Castle Oak developments nearby. *The applicant stated they believed they could avoid blasting and that was their intention. Did not guarantee they would not.*
- Residents expressed concern that with developments there would be kids in the development who would be attracted to play around the ridge line. These residents wanted to know what safety measures were planned. *Applicant stated they did not have a plan for that case but were open to ideas.*
- There were general concerns with traffic on Ridge Road.
- General concerns regarding overall growth in the Town were raised.
- There were general questions regarding the process.

Neighborhood Meeting Summary – Founders Vista (Memmen Young)  
Third Neighborhood Meeting – January 5, 2022

Rusty Hall with Highline Engineering held a neighborhood meeting to discuss a proposed Annexation, PD Zoning Amend, Site Development, and Skyline/Ridgeline project known as Founders Vista (Memmen Young). Founders Vista is approximately 180.5 acres in size and located south of 5<sup>th</sup> Street, east of North Ridge Road, and north of Plum Creek Blvd (see attached vicinity map).

This meeting represented the third required neighborhood meeting. The meeting was conducted in a hybrid format, both in-person and virtual via Zoom. The neighborhood meeting notice was mailed to all neighbors within 500-feet of the proposed project and open for any public to attend. Prior to the neighborhood meeting, all neighbors were provided with a vicinity map, project narrative, PD Zoning map and Site Development Plan. The meeting was scheduled for Jan. 5, 2022 from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. The following represents a summary of the neighborhood meeting.

Applicant Representatives:

1. Rusty Hall, Highline Engineering
2. Chris Meeks, Highline Engineering
3. Roy Mason, Malcor

Town Representatives:

1. Councilmember Johnson
2. David Corliss, Town Manager
3. Tara Vargish, PE, Director of Development Services
4. Brad Boland, AICP, Planner II
5. Cara Reed, Neighborhood Liaison
6. Camden Bender, Community Outreach Program Manager

In-person Public Participants:

1. Irving Johnson
2. Jeff McWilliams
3. Karla McWilliams
4. Jim Cable
5. Debbie Cable
6. Jim Cleaver
7. Sherry Cleaver
8. Stan Peterson
9. Doug Reagan
10. Sherry Lindeman
11. Frank Sieburth
12. Dan Dertz
13. Becky Dertz
14. Staff counted 16 members of the public present in person
15. Staff counted 16 members of the public present in person
16. Staff counted 16 members of the public present in person

Virtual Public Participants:

17. Laure van Houten

18. tmock
19. Ernie
20. Rachel Corwin
21. David Boardman
22. Beth – Castle Rock
23. Patti
24. 13035268489
25. Annamarie
26. Thomas.Gissen
27. Dan Lorden
28. Brian Kohn
29. Theresa Logan
30. Sam Banister
31. [lacolette@mac.com](mailto:lacolette@mac.com)
32. Craig Austin
33. 19167057503
34. Jeremy's iPhone
35. Jesse Pedroni
36. Chris Galloway
37. Mike.Salmina
38. 1303603958
39. iPhone
40. Jennifer
41. Julie Bear
42. Casi
43. Barb
44. Barb
45. JILL's iPad

The applicant presentation discussed the following:

- Background on the existing Memmen Young zoning
- Provided background on the Site Development Plan
  - a. 561 units with a mixture of single family detached and duplex units
  - b. Two entrances to the property
  - c. Identified of the Open Space
- Identified the four applications under review.
- The majority of the presentation took the form of questions and answer session

Attendees had the following comments:

- Several questions and concerns regarding the need for blasting on this site - Applicant stated that there is the expectation that there will be the need for blasting on the site during the construction process. The applicant stated they did not have the information readily available to answer all the questions and will provide the information requested at the next neighborhood meeting.
- What will the ownership of the Open Space be? – Applicant stated the Town will take ownership of a majority of the Open Space with a large portion being for a public park and the rest as passive open space. Detention ponds will be separate tracts and privately owned.

- Several questions and concerns regarding the cul-de-sac finger near the ridge line above Gordon Lane. The applicant stated;
  - The edge of cliff is defined as where the slope is greater than 3 to 1.
  - The area is not an identified ridge line or skyline area per the Town's Skyline/Ridgeline ordinance.
  - The zoning proposed will limit height to 25 feet for the outer homes.
- Questions and concerns about the skyline/ridge line variance. The applicant stated;
  - Analyzed from finished grade.
  - Applicant believes that the proposed lots won't be visible due to surrounding homes
- Questions and general concerns about water. The applicant stated;
  - The ground water rights of the property will serve the property
  - General questions about water and overall development would need to be answered by the Town.
- Concerns raised about people parking on the Gordon Dr to use the detention pond service road. The applicant stated that the service road would not be open to the public and could look into signage and possible chain barrier to discourage people from using it. The applicant did state that the service road on the southern portion of the property is intended to be open to the public for pedestrian use.
- A concern was raised that there wouldn't be an effective wildlife corridor and specifically the area between the cul-de-sac finger and cliff edge would not be wide enough. The applicant stated they would reach out to the Colorado Parks and Wildlife to see if they may have additional comments.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m.

## Neighborhood Meeting Summary

**Application: Memmen Young Major PD Amendment (Founders Vista)**

**Property Owner:** Memmen Family

**Meeting #: 4**

**Date/Time:** Thursday, May 18, 2023, 6:30 pm, (Adjourned at 8:45 pm)

**Meeting Location:** Mesa Middle School

**Councilmember District:** Councilmember Brooks

### Applicant's Proposal:

A rezoning of 175.5 acres of the Memmen Young Planned Development to allow for 334 single family detached homes and 114 paired homes (228 units) for a total of 562 units. The current zoning allows for 428 single family detached homes and 476 multifamily units. The application also includes an annexation of a 5-acre parcel located in the middle of the Memmen Young Planned Development bringing the total project size to 180.5 acres.

### Attendees

#### Applicant Representatives:

Rusty Hall, Highline Engineering

Chris Meeks, Highline Engineering

Jim Nobel, Buckley Powder Company

#### Public Attendees:

##### *In-person Attendees:*

James Putnam

Sherry Lindeman

Geoff Lycas

Doug Reagen

Nikke Candle

Jeff McWilliams

Karla McWilliams

Lalo Omar

DeA???? Eye???? (62 Gordon Ln)

Stan Peterson

Travis Holland

Jill Holland

Angela Fezza

Cozy Swickard

Frank Sieburth

Caryn Johnson

##### *Online/Phone Attendees:*

Anna Marie

Mary K Pearson

**Town Staff Attendees:**

Brad Boland, Long Range Project Manager, Town of Castle Rock

**Presentation Description****Applicant's Presentation:**

The applicant started with a presentation by Jim Noble, with Buckley Powder Company, in regards to the blasting process and Town requirements. Q and A with Mr. Noble followed. The applicant, Rusty Hall, then gave a presentation that went over the zoning application and touched on the SDP which is a separate application. Questions were taken throughout the presentation. The majority of the Q/A and comments centered on concerns of residents about rock fall dangers from the development and their desire for houses to be pushed further away.

**Questions Presented to Applicant:**

*Q: Where will blasting take place*

A: Applicant, at this time, was anticipating that blasting would occur roughly within the first 2/3 of the property from Ridge Rd moving west.

*Q: Could noticing of blasting be required further than 500 feet from blasting?*

A: That would be a question for Castle Rock Fire.

*Q: Will blasting occur near the ridgeline?*

A: Applicant anticipates other means of earth work near the ridgeline.

*Q: Why have the geotechnical studies required for blasting not been done at this time?*

A: The specific studies required for blasting occur later in the process, with the civil construction documents. These studies are done by a 3<sup>rd</sup> party contracted by the blasting company.

*Q: How were the viewing platforms for the ridgeline determined?*

A: The viewing platforms were created with the skyline/ridgeline ordinance in 1999.

*Q: How much traffic will be generated?*

A: Applicant stated approximately 500 trips during peak hours. Applicant stated all intersection would operate at A/B level (graphic shown appeared to show some C/D at certain intersections)

*Q: What about water?*

A: The applicant stated that the underlying ground water will be dedicated to the Town. This water is sufficient to serve the project. The project will follow the developed Water Efficiency Plan and the Town's new water requirements, whatever are more stringent.



## Neighborhood Meeting Summary

### **Application: Site Development Plan**

**Property Owner:** Memmen Young-Founders Vista

**Meeting #:** 5

**Date/Time:** Monday, December 9, 2024 (Adjourned at 7:15 pm)

**Meeting Location:** Town Council Chambers

**Councilmember District:** Council Member Brooks

### **Applicant's Proposal:**

The applicant is proposing 297 single family detached residences and 224 single family attached residences for a total of 521 dwelling units on 180.5 acres. The Site Development Plan proposes 99.1 acres of public and private open space.

### **Attendees**

#### **Applicant Representatives:**

Rusty Hall – Highline Engineering

James Marine - Aegis Engineering

Rob Yeoman - Kumar & Associates, Inc.

Jim Knoll - Buckley Powder Company

Jerome Kostantewicz - Buckley Powder Company

Chris Meeks - Hope Homes

#### **Public Attendees:**

*3 In-person Attendee:*

*4 Online/Phone Attendees*

#### **Town Staff Attendees:**

Tara Vargish, Development Services Director, Town of Castle Rock

Brad Boland, Long Range Project Manager, Town of Castle Rock

### **Presentation Description**

#### **Applicant's Presentation:**

The applicant provided an overview of the property and the zoning that was approved by Town Council in 2023. The applicant gave an overview of the site development plan and identified areas of change since the last neighborhood meeting such as the moving homes way from the ridgeline. The applicant then discussed the blasting process that will be used to develop the property and had a geotechnical engineer and blasting company representative discuss their roles and talk about their processes.

## Questions Presented to Applicant:

*Q: A question was asked if the meshing used to secure rock during blasting would remain after blasting.*

A: The geotechnical engineer responded that an analysis would be done on a case-by-case basis for each location as the project progressed.

*Q: How long would the duration be for the blasting*

A: The expected dirt work construction duration would be 12 months and there could be the potential of up to 3 blasts a week.

*Q: What would be the noticing requirements.*

A: The blasting team will follow all state and Town of Castle Rock noticing requirements. Noticing will be sent to property owners within 1000 feet of the blasting activity. The notice will include detail of the blasting activity.

*Q: Will inspection of homes be offered prior to blasting.*

A: It is required that the blasting company offer 3<sup>rd</sup> party inspections of the outside and inside of homes to homeowners within 500 feet of the blasting area prior to submitting a blasting permit to the Town.

*Q: General questions on why blasting will occur and how/where the rock blasted will be used.*

A: Blasting is needed due to the cap rock and the need level the site, trench for utilities, and potentially for basements. The rock blasted will be grinded on site and used as fill.

*Q: Where will the grinder be located and how loud will it be?*

A: The grinder will be most likely located in the middle of the property and it will have to meet the Town's noise requirements.

*Q: What is the detention pond designed for?*

A: The detention pond is designed for a 100-year storm.

*Q: What is the detention pond designed for?*

A: The detention pond is designed for a 100-year storm.

*Q: Why is an access road needed from Gordon Drive?*

A: The access road is for the maintenance of a detention pond and is required by the Town. It is not open to the public and generally it would be expected the access road would be used about 2 times a year for maintenance activities.

*Q: Why are other proposed developments such as Chateau Valley included in the traffic study?*

A: The applicant responded that such developments are incorporated in the traffic study analysis.

## Neighborhood Meeting Summary

**Application: Founders Vista Site Development Plan**

**Property Owner:** 176

**Meeting #:** 6

**Date/Time:** Wednesday, May 14, 2025, 6 PM (Adjourned at 7:15)

**Meeting Location:** Hybrid – Town Council Chambers

**Councilmember District:** Council Member Brooks

### Applicant's Proposal:

The applicant is proposing 297 single family detached residences and 107 paired homes (214 dwelling units) for a total of 511 dwelling units on 180.5 acres. The Site Development Plan proposes 98.9 acres of public and private open space.

### Attendees

#### Applicant Representatives:

Rusty Hall – Highline Engineering

James Marine - Aegis Engineering

Rob Yeoman - Kumar & Associates, Inc.

Jim Knoll - Buckley Powder Company

Jerome Kostantewicz - Buckley Powder Company

Blake Carlson – Carlson Land Development

#### Public Attendees:

*8 In-person Attendee:*

*3 Online/Phone Attendees*

#### Town Staff Attendees:

Kevin Wrede, Planning Manager, Town of Castle Rock

Brad Boland, AICP, Long Range Project Manager, Town of Castle Rock

### Presentation Description

#### Applicant's Presentation:

The applicant provided an overview of the property and the zoning that was approved by Town Council in 2023. The applicant gave an overview of the site development plan and identified areas of change through the design process such as the moving homes way from the ridgeline. The applicant went over the generally layout, open space configuration, and location of detention ponds. The applicant then discussed the blasting process that will be used to develop the property and had a geotechnical engineer and blasting company representative discuss their roles and talk about their processes.

### Questions Presented to Applicant:

*Q: How much cut and fill will occur on the site?*

A: There will be some deeper blasts/cuts for specific infrastructure, beyond that, = cuts will generally be in the range of 0-10 feet to balance the site.

*Q: How does the cut and fill impact the ridgeline/skyline regulations and will there be any requests for variances?*

A: The height of structures is measured from the final grade. A condition of approval for the zoning was that no variances could be applied for.

*Q: Are the detention ponds designed for 100-year storms and should they be designed for larger storms?*

A: The detention ponds are designed for 100-year storms as is required by the Town's regulations.

*Q: Why were traffic counts from COVID used in the traffic study?*

A: Traffic counts were taken before, during, and after COVID and final traffic counts used for the analysis were increased by 10% for good measure.

*Q: Will the netting that is used to secure rocks during the blasting remain?*

A: That will be looked at a case-by-case basis and community input will be taken.

*Q: Are wells taken into account during blasting?*

A: Yes, wells are taken into account when designing the blasting program.

*Q: What is the timeline of this project?*

A: The project is scheduled for planning commission and Town Council. If approved, then civil construction documents and plats will be submitted and reviewed. Earliest anticipated construction would be Spring of 2026.

*Q: Is there an identified homebuilder?*

A: A national homebuilder is currently under contract for the property. At this time, the applicant cannot identify the homebuilder publicly.