



Meeting Date: June 2, 2020

AGENDA MEMORANDUM

To: Honorable Mayor and Members of Town Council

Through: Tara Vargish, Acting Director, Development Services

From: Donna Ferguson, Senior Planner, Development Services

Title: A RESOLUTION APPROVING A SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR MOST OF OUTLOT A, CASTLE OAKS, FILING NO. 1 (Caliber at Terrain Apartment Complex SDP19-0029)

Executive Summary

The Garrett Companies (applicant) is requesting approval of a site development plan (SDP) for an apartment complex known as Caliber at Terrain. Located in the northeast quadrant of Founders Parkway and State Highway 86 (Figure 1), the SDP proposes 17 three-story buildings containing 238 units, a clubhouse, pool, and dog park.

The Caliber at Terrain project is governed by the Villages at Castle Rock PD. Zoned in August of 1981, the PD contains typical planning areas and zoning regulations but also contains a unique completion clause. The completion clause anticipated the entire 3,600-acre PD to be completed within 25 years of the date of its approval (August of 2006). However, the zoning regulations did not provide any restrictions or remedies for any remaining parcels that have yet to be completed within the 25-year timeframe.

Site development plans which propose new residential development require public hearing before Town Council who shall review and make a decision upon the proposal after review and recommendation by Planning Commission.

Planning Commission Recommendation

On May 14, 2020, following presentations by Town staff and the applicant, testimony by nine members of the public, and a detailed discussion, the Planning



Figure 1: Vicinity map

Commission voted 4-0 to recommend approval of the Caliber at Terrain site development plan subject to the finding that the existing zoning is still valid.

All nine members of the public provided testimony in opposition to the proposed SDP. Public testimony primarily focused on the potential negative impacts of the proposed use on traffic and schools within the surrounding neighborhoods and the 25-year completion clause.

Planning Commission discussion primarily focused on the merits of the proposed site development plan relative to the zoning, outside the scope of the 25-year completion clause. Planning Commission found the proposed SDP to meet or exceed the SDP review and approval criteria. Other topics of discussion were the 25-year completion clause and neighborhood schools.

Discussion

Background

The site is located within a remnant parcel of one of the Town's earliest planned unit developments known as the Villages at Castle Rock PD. Zoned in August of 1981, the Villages at Castle Rock PD extended east of Founders Parkway and Ridge Road to the Town's eastern border. When zoned the Villages at Castle Rock PD envisioned four self-sufficient 'villages' each containing single-family, multi-family, business, and civic uses. Over time, however, all but this remnant parcel of the Villages at Castle Rock PD have been rezoned to amended planned developments known today as Mall and Office Center Infill, Castle Oaks, Terrain, Liberty Village, Founders Village, Bella Mesa, and Castlewood Ranch.

Zoning History

The Villages at Castle Rock PD was zoned in August of 1981. The PD contains typical planning areas and zoning regulations but also contains a unique completion clause, shown in section 8 of the zoning regulations. The completion clause anticipated the entire 3,600-acre PD to be completed within 25 years of the date of its approval (August of 2006). However, the zoning regulations did not provide any restrictions or remedies for any remaining parcels that have yet to be completed within the 25-year timeframe. Since the initial approval of the Villages at Castle Rock PD, the majority of planning areas have been modified and moved into new planned developments that do not include the completion clause. The Town Attorney's Office is prepared to address any Council questions concerning the zoning status of this site.

Existing Conditions

The site is located in the northeast quadrant of Founders Parkway and State Highway 86. It is approximately 26.5 acres in size and is currently undeveloped. It is bounded to the west by Founders Parkway, a Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) arterial roadway, and bounded to the north by a Town open space tract. The open space tract is approximately 70 to 75-feet wide and extends along the entire northern perimeter of the site. The open space tract also contains a section of trail, which is to be improved from a soft surface trail to a concrete trail as part of the Colorado Front Range Trail project. The site also contains an existing regional drainage pond, which lies in the northeast corner of the site and overhead electric lines along the western perimeter and southwest corner of the site.

To the west, across Founders Parkway, is a single-family neighborhood known as the Woodlands. To the north, across the open space tract, is a single-family neighborhood known



Figure 2: Front and rear building elevations

as Terrain. To the east is an undeveloped parcel for a future school district site and beyond that is an undeveloped parcel for a future Town park. Along the southern perimeter of the property, from west to east, is a neighborhood commercial center known as Founders Marketplace, two open space tracts and a Town water treatment facility. The site is relatively elevated sloping down to the west toward Founders Parkway and down to the east toward the existing regional drainage pond. The central portion of the parcel is generally flat and covered by native grasses and minimal shrubs.

SDP Proposal

The SDP proposes 17 three-story multi-family buildings, a clubhouse, pool, dog park and various accessory buildings along with a new road on a 26.5-acre site. Each multi-family building is 40-feet 6-inches tall and contains 14 units and 8 garages providing a total of 10 garage spaces (six one-car garages and two two-car tandem garages) (**Exhibit 1**).

The new road runs through the center of the site and connects to Aloha Street at the southwest corner and to Valley View Drive to the east at Autumn Sage Street.

The road bisects the site into a northern and southern half; eight multi-family buildings, the clubhouse, pool, dog park and existing regional pond are all located on the northern half while the remaining nine multi-family buildings are located on the southern half. 505 parking spaces are proposed for the site, 169 garage parking spaces, 68 driveway spaces and 268 surface parking spaces. The surface parking spaces are divided between the northern half and the southern half and located internal to the site. Open space and landscaping is emphasized

around the perimeter of the site and around the existing regional drainage pond. Also provided is an internal trail, which runs along the eastern boundary of the existing regional drainage pond and connects to the Colorado Front Range Trail.

Two architectural elevations for the buildings are also proposed. The buildings offer a varying roofline and wall planes broken up by windows and a mix of design materials. Materials include stone veneer, siding, and board and batten in a pallet of sage green and tans (Figure 2). Building and site lighting for pedestrian safety are also proposed.

Zoning Regulations

The zoning regulations that govern the development of the parcel are The Villages at Castle Rock PD, which was approved by the Board of Trustees on August 4, 1981. These regulations outline permitted uses, density and development standards by use area. The use area designated for this site is Multi-Family (MF). The MF use area permits both multi-family and single-family attached uses, maximum density of 20 residential units per acre, minimum open space requirement of 20% and maximum building heights of 50-feet.

Zoning Comparison Chart		
Zoning	The Villages at Castle Rock Planned Development (PD)	
Use Area	Multi-Family (MF)	
Total Dwelling Units	238	
1-bedroom units	102	
2-bedroom units	92	
3-bedroom units	44	
	PD Requirement	Provided (this SDP)
Permitted Uses	As per Section II C of the Village at Castle Rock PD Zoning Regulations, includes multi-family	Multi-family
Private Open Space	20%	35.3%
Maximum Dwelling Units per use area	20 DU/Acre	238 Units / 26.48 Ac.=9.0 DU per Ac.
Maximum Building Height	50-feet	40.6-feet
Minimum Front Setback*	15-feet	15-feet
Minimum Rear Setback*	25-feet	25.8-feet
Minimum Side Setback*	15-feet	80.6-feet
Minimum Side to Street Setback*	15-feet	110.8-feet
Minimum Distance Between Buildings	15-feet	16.9-feet
Minimum Parking	One bedroom unit required 1.5 spaces; Two and three bedroom unit requires 2 spaces; Plus 1 space per four dwelling units for visitor parking	Total spaces required = 485 spaces
		102 x 1.5 = 153 spaces
		92 x 2 = 184 spaces
		44 x 2 = 88 spaces
		238/4 x 1 = 60 spaces
		Garage spaces provided = 169
		Driveway spaces provided = 68
		Surface parking provided = 268
Minimum ADA Parking	2% of total spaces to be ADA	Total spaces provided = 505
		ADA spaces required = 11
		ADA spaces provided = 20
Total lot spaces = 505		
* Per section VI of the PD zoning regulations this standard to be determined at time of site development plan		

Figure 3: Zoning Comparison Chart

A comparison of the zoning regulations to the proposed SDP illustrates the proposed SDP meets the permitted uses, density, open space and height requirements of the MF use area (Figure 3). The proposed multi-family use is a designated permitted use. The proposed density of nine residential units per acre is less than half of the maximum permitted density of 20 residential units per acre. Open space is provided at 35% compared to the minimum requirement of 20%. The proposed building height of 40.6-feet is less than the maximum permitted height of 50-feet.

Dissimilar Residential Interface Regulations

Due to an existing 70-foot wide open space tract, which lies between the proposed Caliber at Terrain project and the existing single-family neighborhood to the north, the project is not subject to the Town's Dissimilar Residential Interface Regulations. Despite not being subject to the regulation, the SDP proposes a buffer area and building design elements to mitigate its impact to the existing single-family neighborhood to the north. The buffer area is 25-feet in width and extends along the entire northern perimeter of the site. The buffer area maintains the natural topography of the site and is enhanced by the addition of landscaping. Landscaping consists of a winding line of evergreen trees interspersed with deciduous ornamental trees to provide varied tree types and heights for maximum screening and visual interest. The buffer area is also kept free from buildings, lighting and parking. In addition, the multi-family buildings are oriented and the surface parking located so access to garage parking and surface parking is internal to the site and not visible to the adjacent single-family residential. In general, the proposed SDP meets the purpose and intent of the Dissimilar Residential Interface Regulations.

Transportation and Traffic

The site is adjacent to two major CDOT roadways. Founders Parkway, currently classified as a major arterial is located west of the site; and State Highway 86 (SH-86), functioning as a minor arterial is located south of the site.

Nearby planned Town Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects, outlined in the approved 2020 budget and the 2020 5-year fiscally constrained CIP, include the signalized intersection of Ridge Road/SH-86/5th Street/Founders Pkwy by 2022.

The neighborhood streets are proposed to access the wider transportation network at two new intersections (also known as site accesses); site access on Founders Parkway at Aloha Drive is proposed as a full-movement signalized intersection. Direct access to SH-86 is proposed from the access connection to an existing roundabout located on Autumn Sage Street.

Per Town criteria, Felsburg Holt and Ullevig (FHU) prepared a project-specific traffic impact study (TIS) (**Attachment B**) in order to estimate project traffic and provide recommendations to mitigate traffic impacts. FHU evaluated traffic impacts by comparing existing traffic to year 1 and year 20 projections, both with and without project traffic. The TIS compares different scenarios by estimating the operational level of service (LOS) for each case. LOS is a measure of average intersection delay and is reported on a scale of A through F, with A indicating free flow conditions and F representing congestion conditions.

The TIS studied several existing intersections near the site. The intersections include:

1. SH-86/5th Street/Founders Pkwy/Ridge Road intersection

2. SH-86/Autumn Sage
3. Autumn Sage/Aloha Street
4. Aloha Drive/Founders Pkwy

The SH-86/5th Street/Founders Pkwy/Ridge Road intersection was found to currently operate at LOS D in peak AM and PM hours. The Year 2040 LOS projection, which includes the CIP improvements, is showing an intersection LOS of C in the AM and LOS D in the PM peak hours as a traffic signal. The ultimate intersection design will be decided by CDOT as part of the CIP project.

The other intersections analyzed in the TIS are also all within the Town's acceptable LOS standards of LOS D. Planned traffic signals at Aloha Drive/Founders Pkwy and at SH-86/Autumn Sage show a projected Year 2040 LOS of A through C.

Public Works plan review engineers evaluated the proposed roadway improvements including the internal street network and site accesses and found the proposed transportation improvements to comply with Town transportation criteria and TIS recommendations.

Neighborhood Outreach

The applicants conducted a total of three neighborhood meetings; one prior to formal submittal, one prior to second submittal and one after the completion of staff review but prior to the Planning Commission hearing. The following represents a summary of the neighborhood meetings.

Meeting #1: The first meeting occurred on April 24, 2019 with approximately 100 people in attendance. At this meeting, the applicant shared a SDP proposal for a multi-family project. The SDP has the following attributes:

- 226 luxury apartments
- 21 two-story buildings
- 204 garage parking spaces and 212 surface parking spaces
- Access point at Aloha St.
- Gated community
- Clubhouse, fitness center, pool, dog park, and open space.

The majority of attendees expressed opposition to the proposal and voiced the following:

- Burden on school system. Project would add to school overcrowding due to additional kids and under funding of schools.
- Burden on Town infrastructure such as water, sewer, roads. Escavera experiencing sewer problems now.
- Burden on Town services such as fire, police, emergency medical due to additional families.
- Negative impact to nearby home values.
- Inappropriate location for multi-family next to single-family. Why can't townhomes be developed instead?
- Increased traffic to neighborhood to the east due to Valley View access point.
- Fear that luxury apartments will turn into low-income housing.

- Name of project is confusing as it is not located within the Terrain community.

Approximately 10% of the attendee expressed acknowledgement of the following:

- Property is already zoned for multi-family and has been since 1981.
- Proposal is nice for what is it.
- Proposal is not as dense as it could be.
- If not Garrett companies, it could be a different developer who could propose something worse.

Meeting #2: The second meeting occurred on September 25, 2019 with approximately 50 people in attendance. At this meeting, the applicant shared an alternative SDP proposal for their multi-family project. The SDP has the following attributes:

- 238 luxury apartments instead of 226 as previously proposed.
- 17 three-story buildings instead of 22 two-story buildings as previously proposed.
- Increased distance from the single-family residential to the north.
- Access to garage parking redesigned so no longer visible to adjacent single-family residential.
- Lowering of the site vs. filling the site as previously proposed.
- Not gated vs. gated as previously proposed.
- Access point at Valley View Dr. in addition to Aloha Street.
- Same amenities proposed: clubhouse, fitness center, pool, dog park, and open space.

The majority of attendees expressed opposition to the proposal and voiced the following:

- Inappropriate location for multi-family next to single-family.
- Too dense for the location. Density belongs downtown not in the Terrain.
- Would rather see townhomes, row homes or patio homes Instead of apartments.
- Burden on Town infrastructure such as water, sewer, roads.
- Concern that apartment residents would utilize Terrain resources.
- Increased traffic at the intersection of Founders Pkwy/Copper Cloud Dr., which is already dangerous.
- Increased traffic and speeds on Autumn Sage Street.
- Fear that luxury apartments will turn into low-income housing.
- Wildlife concerns.
- Lighting concerns.
- Proposed plan does not add any value to citizens, instead it adds to citizen issues revealed in the Community Survey such as unchecked growth, overcrowding and traffic congestion.
- Call to action to contact public officials to express dissatisfaction.

Meeting #3: The third and final meeting, a virtual meeting, occurred on May 7, 2020 with approximately 50 people in attendance. At this meeting, the applicant shared the final SDP proposal for their multi-family project. The neighborhood meeting was offered to all neighbors within 500-feet of the proposed SDP project. The meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom, a video conference platform. Prior to the virtual meeting, all neighbors were provided with a

project narrative and vicinity map as well as the site plan, section plan, and architectural plans from the final SDP proposal. The Zoom meeting allowed neighbors to participate online or by phone. The applicant highlighted the following proposed SDP attributes:

- 238 luxury apartments
- 17 three-story buildings
- 169 internal garages, well over 300 surface parking spaces
- Orientation of buildings internal to the site
- Addition of Juliet balconies, a railing in front of a sliding door, for units without standard balcony space
- 25-foot landscape buffer along northern edge of site
- Internal trail connecting to Town trail system
- Minimum distance of 158.2-feet between apartment building and single-family residences to the north
- Ground elevation difference of 35-feet to 45-feet between apartment buildings and single-family residences to the north with apartment buildings situated at lower ground elevations than single-family residences to the north
- Clubhouse, fitness center, pool, and dog park

Attendees expressed the following:

- Question about the use of “Terrain” in the Caliber at Terrain project name. Applicant responded the project would not have “Terrain” or “Caliber” in the name going forward. Caliber at Terrain was a temporary name only.
- Question about trees and a fence in the 25-foot landscape buffer. Applicant responded a variety of tree types that are 2-inch caliper in size are proposed for the buffer while a fence is not proposed for the buffer.
- Questions about traffic mitigation and use of speedbumps along proposed Aloha Street. Applicant responded they are mitigating their traffic per Town requirements and CDOT’s recommendations. Speedbumps along Aloha Street are not proposed nor requested by the Town.
- Questions about apartment management, size, rent and future sale of the project. Applicant responded they have a quality management team that can handle any issues that arise. Average size of an apartment is 1,000 square feet. Market rate rent apartments are proposed, there are no income restricted rent apartments proposed. They cannot make any projection on whether the project will be sold. Stating these decisions are made on a case-by-case basis depending upon a number of factors. They are building a quality project and that most likely anyone buying the project would want to protect their quality investment by providing quality management.
- Question about how the project will participate in school development. Applicant responded they have worked with the school district during the review process and explained that the zoning already provides for land for schools.
- Questions about construction timing, process, and dust mitigation. Applicant responded they would like to break ground in the summer of 2020 and expect an 18 to 24 month construction process. They will use water to keep dust down during construction and will follow all Town regulations.
- Question about how the project will mitigate water usage. Applicant responded they would look at irrigation efficiencies as a way of mitigating water usage.

- Question as to what the Garrett Companies is providing the Town for common use. Applicant responded they are providing a public road for common use.
- Questions about the project site design related to lighting, power lines, retaining walls, and dog park. The applicant responded by answering all questions about the project site design which were general in nature.
- Question about how existing prairie dogs on the site will be handled. Applicant responded they would follow Town guidelines.
- Comment that proposed site development plan does not address concerns of citizens. Instead, it adds to citizen concerns identified in the Town's Community Survey of growing too fast, overcrowding and traffic congestion.

In addition to the comments collected through the neighborhood meeting process, Town staff received 42 neighborhood comments via e-mail (as of May 27, 2020) from neighbors living within the project area (**Attachment C**). These comments expressed similar concerns voiced at the neighborhood meetings.

External Referrals

Requests for external comments were sent to various utility service providers, Douglas County Government, Douglas County Schools, Colorado Department of Transportation, Colorado Division of Wildlife, Colorado Geological Survey, Cherry Creek Basin Water Quality Authority and to surrounding HOAs and Metro Districts. Comments received from review agencies were technical in nature and reconciled through the review process. There were no objections provided.

Public Notice

Posted, written and published notices were performed in accordance with the Town of Castle Rock Municipal Code.

Budget Impact

Development of the property will generate review and impact fees, along with use taxes. Other ongoing costs of serving a new multi-family residential development, in terms of public infrastructure and amenities, as well as police and fire protection, will be comparable to other similar multi-family residential developments in Castle Rock.

Review and Approval Criteria Analysis

Site development plans are evaluated on criteria set forth in 17.38.040-SDP Review and Approval Criteria of Town Municipal Code. Following is an enumeration of the SDP review and approval criteria and an analysis of the proposed site development plan to the review and approval criteria.

A. Community Vision/Land Use Entitlements.

1. Generally conforms to the Town's guiding documents that include, but are not limited to, Town Vision, Comprehensive Master Plans, Sub Area Plans, Design Guidelines, Corridor Plans and any other guiding document so long as the application of such document does not restrict the project's entitled use(s) and density.
2. Complies with existing Intergovernmental Agreements applicable to the development proposed.

3. Complies with any applicable Zoning Overlay Regulations and, if applicable, Skyline/Ridgeline Regulations.
4. Complies with the approved Planned Development Plan and Zoning Regulations.
5. Conforms to the Town's architectural goals by proposing architectural details that incorporate the use of high quality materials in a unique and varied design, while eliminating monolithic expanses of walls and rooflines through the use of varying planes and architectural projections to ensure a complete 360-degree architectural design.
6. Complies with all other relevant requirements of the CRMC.

Analysis: The proposed SDP meets this criterion. It generally conforms to the Town's Vision and Comprehensive Master Plan and complies with the site's governing zoning, the Villages at Castle Rock PD. It also conforms to the Town's architectural goals as well as complies with all relevant requirements and development standards of Town Municipal Code.

B. Site Layout.

1. Conforms to Chapter 17.50 Residential/Non-Residential Interface of the CRMC.
2. Site design shall be designed to maintain pedestrian and vehicle safety, provide for adequate fire safety, and mitigate impacts upon adjacent properties by ensuring all vehicular, fire and mitigation regulations contained within the CRMC, including technical criteria, have been met.
3. Provides adequate parking, on-site circulation and loading in accordance with Town regulations.
4. Provides appropriate screening and/or enclosure of outdoor storage of merchandise/materials, loading areas, trash receptacles, mechanical units, site utility equipment and building mounted utility hardware.
5. Provides adequate site design to protect major environmental characteristics that would include unique topographic features and significant vegetation where possible.

Analysis: The proposed SDP meets this criterion. The SDP meets all relevant site layout requirements outlined in the governing zoning and Town Municipal Code.

C. Circulation and Connectivity.

1. Complies with all CRMC and technical criteria associated with circulation and connectivity.
2. Complies with all Fire regulations associated with land development.
3. Provides for pedestrian and bicycle traffic in a safe and convenient manner.
4. Provides for a high level of pedestrian connectivity between neighborhoods, schools, trails/open space and commercial areas.

Analysis: The proposed SDP meets this criterion. The SDP provides two vehicular entrances into the site and vehicular circulation throughout the site. The SDP also provides pedestrian circulation via detached sidewalks and pedestrian paths within the site. It also provides a connection to a nearby neighborhood commercial center, a future school district site, and future Town park.

D. Services Phasing and Off-site Impacts.

1. Complies with any phasing requirements associated with the approved zoning for the property. Provides phased improvements in a logical and efficient manner.
2. Adequate water resources have been conveyed or purchased. Existing or proposed water and wastewater systems can support the proposed development pattern, uses and density.
3. Existing or proposed stormwater systems can support the development and comply with applicable regulations.
4. Provides adequate consideration for the future extension of streets and utilities to adjacent properties.
5. Identifies and appropriately provides on-site and off-site public improvements to mitigate traffic impacts as required by the CRMC and technical criteria.

Analysis: The proposed SDP meets this criterion. The SDP provides adequate and efficient utility plans for water, stormwater, and wastewater, which considered existing conditions and meet Town Municipal Code. It also proposes access plans and intersection improvements for traffic based on traffic impact studies and Town and CDOT transportation plans.

E. Open Space, Public Lands and Recreation Amenities.

1. Provides adequate trail systems in terms of internal circulation and appropriate external connections deemed necessary by the Town to achieve connectivity goals.
2. Ensures functional and accessible open space, consistent with the overall open space plan for development and preserves significant natural features.
3. Ensures appropriate buffering, utilizing open space and/or setbacks to lessen any identified negative impacts.

Analysis: The proposed SDP meets this criterion. The SDP provides an internal trail system, which connects to a broader trail system. Emphasizes open space around the perimeter of the site and around the existing regional drainage pond. In addition, the SDP proposes a buffer area, which is 25-feet in width that extends along the entire northern perimeter of the site.

Neighborhood Comments Evaluation

Neighborhood comments have been provided to and collected by the Town throughout the application, outreach, and review process of the proposed SDP. Following is a summary of neighborhood comments and an evaluation of neighborhood comments set forth in 17.38.040-SDP Review and Approval Criteria of Town Municipal Code.

- Inappropriate location for multi-family next to single-family. The proposed multi-family project is a permitted use per the zoning, which has been in place since August of 1981.
- Too dense for the location. The proposed density of the multi-family project is less than half of what is permitted per the zoning.
- Preference for townhomes, row homes or patio homes instead of apartments. The applicant, the Garrett Companies, is an apartment homebuilder. They do not build townhomes, row homes or patio homes. Apartments are a permitted use per the zoning.

- Burden on Town infrastructure such as water, sewer, and roads. The proposed multi-family project will mitigate its impacts (as determined by utility, drainage, and traffic impact studies) to Town infrastructure per Town Code
- Burden on Town services such as fire, police, and emergency medical. The proposed multi-family project is entitled to and can be accommodated into Town fire, police, and emergency medical service systems.
- Burden on school system. The Douglas County School District obligation for the MF use area was provided at time of zoning. The Douglas County School District has full authority over school development.
- Fear of apartments negatively impacting nearby home values. The SDP proposes luxury apartments with amenities in an area perceived as desirable.
- Concern that apartment residents would utilize Terrain resources. The proposed multi-family project will provide resident amenities such as a fitness center, pool, dog park, and open space.
- Increased traffic and intersection safety concerns. The proposed multi-family project will mitigate its traffic impacts by providing road improvements per the traffic impact study.
- Wildlife concerns. The Colorado Division of Wildlife reported no wildlife concerns.
- General lighting and dark sky lighting concerns. The proposed multi-family project will meet all lighting standards per Town Municipal Code.
- Proposed plan does not add any value to citizens, instead it adds to citizen issues revealed in the Community Survey such as growing too fast, overcrowding and traffic congestion. The proposed multi-family project generally conforms to the 2030 Vision, the 2030 Comprehensive Master Plan, and the Transportation Master Plan.

Findings

Planning Commission and Town staff find the proposed site development plan meets the Town's Site Development Plan review and approval criteria as outlined in this report under 17.38.040 SDP Review and Approval Criteria Analysis.

Recommendation

The Planning Commission voted 4-0 to recommend approval of the Caliber at Terrain site development plan subject to the finding that the existing zoning is still valid.

Proposed Motion

I move to approve the resolution as introduced by title.

Attachments

Attachment A: Resolution

Exhibit 1: Site development plan

Attachment B: Traffic impact study

Attachment C: Neighborhood comments