



December 8, 2023

Jefferson County – Planning and Zoning
100 Jefferson County Parkway, Suite 3550
Golden, CO 80419
Attn: Dylan Monke, Planner

Re: Shadow Mountain Bike Park - Case No. Case No. 23-102980 RZ

Dear Mr. Monke,

We are in receipt of the First Referral Response Letter from Jefferson County Planning and Zoning, dated June 5, 2023, as part of the first referral of the application for a special use for the Shadow Mountain Bike Park project (the “**Application**”). With this letter, we are providing the following responses to comments received.

I. General

Comment 1. *The submitted Written Restrictions do not clearly define the maximum impact of the proposed use nor the visual or audial impacts of the proposed park. The applicant will be required to provide a number of additional details to refine compatibility, visual impacts, proposed use, noise, wildfire hazards, and site design.*

Response: Noted and additional details are provided in the Written Restrictions provided with this submittal package.

Comment 2. *The applicant’s proposal would not meet with the Conifer/285 Corridor Area Plan recommended land use for this site. The Comprehensive Master Plan recommends this area for 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres. Staff evaluated the following three factors when assessing proposed uses that are not supported by the Plan:*

- a) how will the impacts associated with the proposed land use(s) be mitigated compared with the recommended Land Uses;*
- b) are the proposed land uses compatible with the surrounding Land Use Recommendations and community character; and*
- c) what change of circumstance has occurred in the local area since the Land Use Recommendation was adopted.*

Response: See “First Referral Response – Long Range Planning – SMBP” where this comment is addressed in detail.

II. ODP Document

Comment 1. *Land Use Area Definitions - Day Lodge is not limited by size and includes notions of, "other services, Other Entertainment" that need to be more clearly defined. These limitations should have matching evaluations in trip generation, wastewater and other supporting documents.*

Response: The applicant has removed the reference to "other services" from the Written Restrictions and added maximum building square footage for Use Area A in which the Day Lodge will be located.

Comment 2. *Permitted Uses - Some of the proposed language seems vague. It is unclear how the park will be used during "closure" periods, maximum impact of some of the proposed uses and how the features on site will be limited. See Proposed Written Restrictions for full staff comments.*

Response: The Written Restrictions now clarify that Shadow Mountain Bike Park will be closed to guests during the Seasonal Closure (as in, there will be no regular business hours during which guests may use the Shadow Mountain Bike Park). Please note that the applicant intends to permit special events during the Seasonal Closure, pursuant to the County's Special Event Permit process.

Comment 3. *Setbacks- No setbacks are proposed beyond the typical A-2 standards. However, wildfire mitigation recommends 300- foot setbacks from property lines, this is strongly recommended by staff. Other setbacks may include distances from property lines "trails 30-foot from property lines" either written by cardinal direction or illustrated as "Non-Disturbance Areas" graphically on Page 5 of the submitted Written Restrictions supporting pages.*

Response: The Written Restrictions now integrate setbacks, including a 50 foot setback for vertical development (buildings), bike trails, and the Access Road from the Property boundaries. Additionally, non-disturbance areas are illustrated on the Site Plan.

Comment 4. *Parking Standards - No building maximum is proposed with this document. Maximum building size, occupancy and parking ratio are required to evaluate maximum impacts of use, parking, transportation, water and wastewater. Justification on how the proposed lot is compatible with surrounding residential uses is required.*

Response: The Written Restrictions now integrate maximum building square footage for each Use Area, maximum occupancy at Shadow Mountain Bike Park, and a maximum number of parking spaces to be provided. The applicant has not integrated a parking ratio due to the nature of the use being primarily outdoors. Comparable uses, like "Active Recreational Uses" do not have a defined parking ratio, but instead are addressed by Special Review. See Zoning Resolution Section 14.D. The applicant proposes a maximum of 320 parking spaces. If staff would prefer to see a parking ratio or parking minimum, we would be happy to discuss this item further.

Comment 5. *Site Mitigation - More could be done to meet the Temporary Area of Refuge and other recommendations of the Wildfire Risk Assessment. For instance, the proposed location of the parking*

lot makes it unable to meet these recommendations on-site. Similarly, staff has concerns with parking lot proposed over existing wetland, floodplain areas and in close proximity to property lines.

Response: The Applicant has prepared a Wildfire Hazard Mitigation Plan, included with this resubmittal package. The recommendations within the Plan have been incorporated into the ODP Written Restrictions and Site Plan. Additionally, the Applicant has included additional restrictions around developing over wetlands. Refer to the ODP Written Restrictions included in this resubmittal package.

Comment 6. *Please review the attached ODP document with red marks related to formatting and content.*

Response: Noted.

III. Plan Recommendation

Comment 1. *The subject property is located within the Conifer/285 Corridor Plan. Area 14 is recommended for residential development at 5 to 12 dwelling units per acre.*

Response: Noted.

IV. Traffic & Engineering

Comment 1. *This land use does not align with a trip generation code identified in the ITE 10th editions. Greater justification for 1.5 turnover of vehicles per day using data collected from similar land uses is required.*

Response: Please see “First Referral Response – Planning Engineering – SMBP” for detailed response.

Comment 2. *Saturday and Sunday PM periods were not analyzed and will be required to be evaluated for the 2nd referral.*

Response: Please see “First Referral Response – Planning Engineering – SMBP” for detailed response.

Comment 3. *The County does not support the use of left turn acceleration lanes. Revise Table 1a, 1b and other places in the report which show a mitigated level of service.*

Response: Please see “First Referral Response – Planning Engineering – SMBP” for detailed response.

Comment 4. *Provide a justification for 1% annual growth rate used for future traffic projections in 2025 and 2042.*

Response: Please see “First Referral Response – Planning Engineering – SMBP” for detailed response.

Comment 5. *Per the narrative, the applicant will work with local Sheriff and/or Road and Bridge authority within ROW to enforce no-parking along Shadow Mountain Drive. Please describe the type of work that the applicant is committing to provide.*

Response: Please see “First Referral Response – Planning Engineering – SMBP” for detailed response.

Comment 6. *Engineering will require surface of roads or parking lots removed from Written Restrictions. If approved, these details are to be evaluated with Site Development Plan and Land Development Regulations processes. The applicant is advised to be aware that parking lots and roads exceeding 150 trips per day are required to be paved.*

Response: Noted.

- V. Documents required for second submittal.
1. Revised ODP and Written Restrictions – See ODP Written Restrictions
 2. Cover Letter addressing conformance with the Comprehensive Master Plan – See conformance discussion in “First Referral Response – Long Range Planning – SMBP”
 3. Sensory Impact Study – See Sensory Impact Assessment
 4. Revised Transportation Information including maximum building limitations, similar land use data – See “First Referral Response – Planning Engineering – SMBP”
 5. A Wildfire Mitigation Plan as well as an Analysis/Technical documentation for the chairlift as it relates to the probability of starting fires satisfactory to the CSFS Golden Field Office – See Wildfire Mitigation Plan. The Applicant asked for clarification on the requested analysis / technical documentation for the equipment with CSFS contacts John White and Hilary Hiatt. In an August 8, 2023 email correspondence, the CSFS indicated that they “will not require the analysis on the probability of the infrastructure starting a fire,” so there is no response regarding this request.
 6. Updated Visual Analysis – See Visual Analysis.

Sincerely,



Phil Bouchard
Shadow Mountain Bike Park



Jason Evans
Shadow Mountain Bike Park