

November 22, 2021

Town of Parker  
Engineering Department  
BrieAnna Simon, Associate Planner  
20120 E. Mainstreet  
Parker, CO 80138

**RE: Douglas 234 Filing 6 Lot 3 McDonalds Site Plan and Civil Plan – 2<sup>nd</sup> Review**

Dear Ms. Simon,

Thank you for the comments within October/November for the above-mentioned project. In an effort to address your comments concisely and simplify your review of the plans, we have summarized your comments and our responses below.

## **TRAFFIC AND ROADWAY REVIEW COMMENTS**

### **Traffic Study**

1. The Town will review the updated traffic study being provided by Rick Engineering when submitted. Please ensure the queuing analysis and exhibit are attached to that study.
  - *Response: The Site Plan with the queuing of cars was provided to Rick Engineering. Please note that the stacking of cars from menu board to drive-thru entrance is 6 cars (not including the two at the menu board). This stacking exceeds the McDonald's prototypical stacking of cars based on their field data across the country but was provided to meet fire review comments. Thank you.*
2. Comment response regarding drainage easements noted. Please provide legal descriptions and exhibits for drainage easement areas once ready.
  - *Response: We are currently working with the surveyor to get the easements and legal descriptions drafted and will submit to the platform once available. Please inform if these documents are to be submitted via a different platform or directly to the City Engineer.*

## **STORMWATER REVIEW COMMENTS**

### **Construction Plans – General Comments**

3. Provide a minimum of 7-feet from the drip line of any existing or proposed tree and any storm sewer infrastructure. Response notes this as being provided, but multiple trees' driplines as shown on the site plan fall within 7-feet and some even overlap the proposed storm.
  - *Response: Tree locations have been updated to provide 7' clearance between the dripline and storm lines.*
4. Per SDECM table 6.3, RCP shall be a minimum of 18-inches in diameter. Replace all 12-inch RCP with 18-inch.
  - *Response: Storm sewer was replaced with 18" RCP.*
5. Provide a minimum drop of 0.2 feet between any proposed pipe invert into a structure and the pipe invert out of a structure.
  - *Response: A 0.2' drop was provided for the proposed storm sewer network.*

6. Per CDOT's standard detail "INLET TYPE C IS NOT HS-20 RATED AND SHALL NOT BE PLACED IN PAVED ROADWAYS. THIS INLET SHALL BE USED ONLY OUTSIDE PAVED ROADWAYS." Replace the existing Type C inlet at the eastern corner of the site or alternatively reconfigure the curb to ensure the inlet will not be run over by vehicles.
  - *Response: The pavement remained to assist with drainage on site but the pavement area was striped and a no parking sign was added to allow for the inlet to remain as is.*
7. Provide CDOT standard detail for RCP.
  - *Response: Detail has been added to sheet C1.13.*

**Drainage Report**

8. Please see Construction Plan – Stormwater comments and update report calculations and narrative as needed to reflect the required changes to the storm sewer infrastructure.
  - *Response: All applicable documents were updated.*

**Sediment and Erosion Control**

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

9. Please relabel CBMP plan sheets as "Initial CBMP Plan" and "Interim/Final CBMP Plan" to match Town standard nomenclature.
  - *Response: Plan titles were updated.*
10. Provide and identify all existing and proposed storm sewer infrastructure. Specifically noted storm sewer pipes are not shown.
  - *Response: Existing and proposed storm sewer infrastructure is now shown and called out.*
11. Replace IPA inlet protection with IPAP inlet protection.
  - *Response: Replaced.*
12. Sheet C1.22: Remove the duplicate RCSC sheet provided and move the second sheet of the RS detail to this sheet.
  - *Response: Duplicate sheet was removed and the second sheet of the RS was moved.*
13. Sheet C1.21: After moving the RS detail sheet to C1.22, provide the missing Rock Sock in Swale (RSS) detail on this sheet.
  - *Response: Detail has been added to sheet C1.23.*
14. Sheet C1.23: Remove duplicate set of SCL detail sheets provided.
  - *Response: Removed.*
15. Update Town of Parker review block to include a signature line. Signature line still noted as missing on the Phase 2 plan sheet.
  - *Response: Signature line added.*

**INTERIM/FINAL CBMP PLANS**

16. Provide inlet protection for the inlet on the southwest corner of the site.
  - *Response: Provided.*

**PARKER WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT**

**Drayton Sanderson / 303-841-4627**

1. PWSD cannot locate the revised plans based on our 7/29/21 comment letter. Please upload the latest PWSD Utility Plans. PWSD is unable to open or download the Irrigation sizing sheet. Please upload the IRR worksheet to etrakit again and verify it can be opened.
  - *Response: PWSD was able to provide comments on 11/17/21. This comment response letter addresses the comments from this date.*

**TOWN OF PARKER COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT – FIRE LIFE AND SAFETY**

**Randall L. Capra / 303-805-3169 / [rcapra@parkeronline.org](mailto:rcapra@parkeronline.org)**

5. The applicant shall, in addition to notating that the UFL is a 6" line, notate the length of the UFL as measured from the "T" in the street to the flange in the building. Address this issue when resubmitting. – **Not satisfied; applicant has not provided overall utility drawings that document on the current submittal. The required Fire Life Safety signature block shall be provided on the cover sheet and the overall utility page. Address this issue when resubmitting.**
  - *Response: We apologize, the PWSD plans did not get submitted with the second submittal. The PWSD plans were submitted with this resubmittal and the signature block was added to the cover sheet and overall utility page.*
  
9. The location of the "Drive Thru" is of concern; while the fire code does not address a "Drive Thru", the lack of stacking with regard to the order boards is an issue. This issue was addressed in the pre-application meeting and does not appear to be addressed with this submittal. As evident at the McDonalds located at both the Lincoln and Jordan location and the Parker Road and Mainstreet location, the stacking in these lanes daily obstruct the access in the front (east for both buildings) as cars line up to place orders. This stacking will affect access into the site specific to emergency apparatus, access to the required fire hydrant, and access to the riser room. The stacking will also impact access for other types of emergency response including rescue units, command vehicles, etc. This issue must be addressed moving forward. Note – This issue will only be exacerbated when the proposed high school is constructed in Hess Ranch to the south of this area. **Not satisfied; while applicant has provided a queueing line that appears to keep vehicles internal, based upon usage of drive through lanes at other Parker McDonald's locations, the four cars shown within the queue lines located just before the order screens indicates that the queueing will likely obstruct access through the site as well as corresponding parking located on the south side of the building. While not speaking for Planning and Zoning or for Engineering, it may be feasible for high usage times, placing an employee outside the building to direct people out of the queueing line and into a parking stall. Signage would be required that stated "NO CARS ALLOWED TO WAIT IN LINE BEFORE THIS POINT." McDonald's and its Franchisees would be responsible for ensuring compliance or risk having the drive-thru lanes shut down for lack of compliance in order to ensure that emergency access is not compromised. Note – This is much like what is done for Charter Schools.**
  - *Response: Per email correspondence with BrieAnna and Randy on November 15, 2021, the current drive-thru with these updated plans was agreed upon by both planning and fire.*

**TOWN OF PARKER DEVELOPMENT REVIEW**

**General Project Comments**

1. The Planning Division references certain sections of the Parker 2035 Master Plan, the Land Development Ordinance (LDO) and the Development Design Standards. Copies of these documents are available at:  
 Parker 2035 Master Plan  
 Development Design Standards  
 Land Development Ordinance
  - *Response: Noted.*
  
2. The Planning Division has made every effort to make this comment letter as comprehensive as possible. However, additional comments that have not been provided as part of this comment letter may be identified as part of future submittals, based on revisions to the project.
  - *Response: Noted.*
  
3. Please contact the referral agencies if you have questions regarding their review comment(s).
  - *Response: Noted.*

4. A redlined plan is included with this memorandum and is intended to supplement and clarify the review comments of this memorandum.
  - *Response: Noted. Thank you.*
5. Final Plans submitted to the Building Department, Engineering Department and Parker Water and Sanitation District must be exactly the same as the approved Site Plan set.
  - *Response: Noted.*
6. The Town of Parker has implemented a naming convention for all applications. For all future documents that are uploaded to TRAKiT please ensure the submittal round is first, the name of the document is second and the name of the project is third. Staff will not refer the application out with this naming convention. Example: "02" or "Second Submittal"
  - *Response: Noted. The names of the documents were updated to follow this format.*
7. Prairie Dog Management: The Town's current land development ordinance section 13.10.250 - Prairie Dog Management requires applicants/developers to make a good faith effort to have any prairie dogs on site relocated. Documentation of this effort will be a condition of the land use application approval/site development and a certificate of compliance will be required prior to issuance of the grading permit. If relocation of the prairie dogs is not available, humane extermination may be considered. Prairie Dog management should begin as early as possible during the review process. Please coordinate with staff.
  - *Response: Noted. Thank you. Please inform on what the next steps are to determine if prairie dogs are even located on the Site. The master developer is constructing the roadways and utility mains and the overlot graded conditions. I would assume they were required to complete this process prior to starting construction and therefore, McDonald's will not be required to complete this process a second time. Please inform.*

**Site Plan and Project Details**

1. Please see the attached redlines for additional information.
  - *Response: Noted.*
2. Please let staff know how public comments from residents will be responded to.
  - *Response: Public comments were responded to in a letter format which was submitted with this resubmittal.*
3. Please note, the site plan cannot be approved until after the replat is recorded. If the property is closed on prior to the replat, the owner will be required to sign the replat.
  - *Response: Noted. Thank you.*

**OUTSIDE REFERRAL AGENCY COMMENTS**

Please address all outside referral agency comments with a written response. The following agencies have provided comments for review:

- Town of Parker – Building
- CenturyLink
- Cherry Creek Basin Water Quality Authority
- Town of Parker – Civil (Construction Plans)
- Town of Parker – Stormwater (Construction Plans)
- Town of Parker – Environmental (Construction Plans)
- Douglas County Planning
- Town of Parker – Stormwater (Drainage Report)
- Town of Parker – Civil (Drainage Report)
- Fire Life Safety
- IREA

- Public Service Company of Colorado
- Town of Parker – Civil (Site Plan)
- Town of Parker – Stormwater (Site Plan)
- Town of Parker – Civil (Traffic Impact Study)

These comments are available on eTRAKiT. Please address accordingly.

- *Response: Comments are addressed in this comment response letter.*

## SITE PLAN REDLINES

### Sheet 3

1. Please add the building setback on all four sides onto the site plan.
  - *Response: Building setbacks were added on all four sides of the site plan.*

### Sheet 6

1. There are still large areas of the plan that foot candles have not been provided. Staff has highlighted a few of these areas in blue. Please provide additional; values to ensure the lighting code has been met. Additional comments may still be provided on the next referral as all values have not been provided.
  - *Response: These areas were filled in with foot-candle readings.*
2. Please provide a light pole detail and indicate how height is being measured.
  - *Response: A detail was added to sheet 6.*
3. Are wall lights been provided? There are no wall lights shown in the Luminaire Schedule. Please adjust accordingly.
  - *Response: There are no wall lights being provided and callouts were removed on the sheet.*
4. Per section 13.10.140 a maximum of one (1) foot-candle is allowed at the lot line of any site.
  - *Response: The foot-candle at all property lines is 1 or less.*
5. Per section 13.10.140 for pedestrian safety and orientation, medium activity lots the maximum Uniformity Ratio (average to minimum) is 3:1. Please adjust accordingly.
  - *Response: Adjusted.*
6. Per section 13.10.140 for pedestrian safety and orientation, medium activity lots the maximum Uniformity Ratio (maximum to minimum) is 10:1. Please adjust accordingly.
  - *Response: Adjusted.*
7. Please adjust labels to the values do not overlap on entire plan.
  - *Response: Labels updated to not overlap.*
8. Please add setbacks for all luminaires. Per section 13.10.140 the setbacks from the property line shall be at least equal to the total height of the luminaire.
  - *Response: Per email correspondence on 11/15 with the Town, the Town is allowing the setback requirement to not be met but the foot-candle must still remain 1.0 or less at the property line. The foot-candle requirement is met on this north side.*

### Sheet 9

1. Please provide an irrigation plan.
  - *Response: The irrigation plan was provided in the Construction Document set but was moved to the Site Plan set.*
2. Please include all symbols on the landscaping plan.
  - *Response: All symbols added to legend.*

3. Native seed cannot be directly adjacent to a sidewalk. Please adjust accordingly.
  - *Response: Noted, native seed has been changed to sod.*
4. Please provide enhanced screening around the trash enclosure. This includes additional evergreens for year round screening.
  - *Response: Additional screening provided around the proposed trash enclosure.*
5. Please review adjacent site plans to ensure landscaping ties into the neighboring lots.
  - *Response: Based on concept plans we have received, we are aligned with the design intent of the adjacent properties.*
6. Please identify which of the approved Town of Parker seed mixes will be used.
  - *Response: No seed is being proposed, seed areas have been changed to a turfgrass sod.*
7. Native cannot be located adjacent to a sidewalk or within the street-tree tree lawn. Please adjust accordingly.
  - *Response: Noted, Native seed no longer proposed in these areas.*
8. Per previous discussing, enhanced landscaping is required along Chambers Road in order to have parking facing the public roadway. Please show the enhanced landscaping and how this is met in the landscaping tables.
  - *Response: Landscaping has been updated along chambers to meet requirements. Chart has been updated to show that additional plantings above site-perimeter requirements have been provided.*
9. What is being provided in this area? This area needs to be landscaped.
  - *Response: Sod is now proposed in this area.*

## Sheet 10

1. There are a number of calculations missing from this table. Please review Section 13.06.070 for all landscape requirements. This table does not provide enough information to show the required landscaping has been met. The site plan will not be approved until all landscape requirements are met. Please see the example above for what should be included. Additionally, please show all substitutions being made and check calculations. Please work with staff if you have question on the landscape requirements.
  - *Response: Code charts have been updated to appear more like the examples provided and provided/required planting counts have been updated accordingly.*
2. Site perimeter landscaping is required on all four sides of the property. Also, these are two separate standards that need to be met. The table below is not being calculated correctly. Please work with staff and adjust accordingly.
  - *Response: Code charts have been updated to appear more like the examples provided and provided/required planting counts have been updated accordingly.*
3. What is the provided/required landscaping in the parking lot perimeter?
  - *Response: There are no specific plant count requirements for the parking lot perimeter section of the code, so this chart has been removed.*
4. Per section 13.06.070(l)(5) one (1) tree and five (5) shrubs shall be planted for each one thousand five hundred (1,500) square feet of lot area not covered by a building or required parking.
  - *Response: This requirement is being met, please reference the updated charts.*

5. Staff is unable to evaluate the landscape plan based on the information provided on the next referral. Please review Section 13.06.070 for required landscaping. Please ask staff if you have questions on what needs to be provided in the landscape evaluation tables.
  - *Response: Code charts have been updated to appear more like the examples provided and provided/required planting counts have been updated accordingly.*
6. Per Section 13.06.070, there are six (6) types of landscaping required for each developed parcel:
  - A. Streetscape landscaping;
  - B. Parking lot perimeter landscaping;
  - C. Parking lot interior landscaping;
  - D. Site perimeter landscaping; and (applies to all four sides of the property)
  - E. Additional areas to be landscaped.

Please provide tables showing all types of landscaping requirements have been met. This includes the required 15 percent landscaping as found in Section 13.06.070(l) and the 75% living requirement. If you have any questions on what is required and/or need examples please let staff know.

  - *Response: Code charts have been updated to appear more like the examples provided and provided/required planting counts have been updated accordingly. Parking lot perimeter landscaping table is not provided as there are no specific plant count requirements. Parking lot interior landscaping table is not provided as there are less than 80 stalls. A note has been added to the plan set to reflect this.*

## Sheet A2.0

1. Where will the electrical panels be located on the building? This will need to be painted to match the building and screened with landscaping.
  - *Response: Please reference architectural comment response letter.*

## Sheet A2.1

1. What is this height?
  - *Response: Please reference architectural comment response letter.*
2. Stone is required to meet the top, middle, base requirements of the Development Design Standards. Please add stone back in on all four sides.
  - *Response: Please reference architectural comment response letter.*
3. Page 55 of the Development Design standards discusses corner elements. Please show the corner elements have been addressed on both fronts of the building.
  - *Response: Please reference architectural comment response letter.*
4. Please provide all dimensions.
  - *Response: Please reference architectural comment response letter.*
5. The trash enclosure shown here does not match what is shown on the site plan. Please provide information the proposed enclosure. Please show all sides of the enclosure.
  - *Response: Please reference architectural comment response letter.*
6. Please provide additional information on the proposed windows and difference between the window types. Are these all transparent, glazed, back lit, etc.?
  - *Response: Please reference architectural comment response letter.*

## Rendering

1. Please add all the dimensions and notes for the elevations on both the colored and black/white.
  - *Response: Please reference architectural comment response letter.*

2. Please provide a physical material board. This application will not be sent out for the next review until a physical material board is provided to staff.
  - *Response: Please reference architectural comment response letter.*
3. Please see comment on the site plan. This enclosure does not match what is shown on the site plan.
  - *Response: Please reference architectural comment response letter.*
4. Per page 68 of the Development Design Standards, field painted standard metal siding is a prohibited material. Please provide information showing the proposed material is an approved material.
  - *Response: Please reference architectural comment response letter.*
5. The proposed mural behind the windows would count as signage. Please adjust accordingly. All murals need to be approved through the site plan process. Please provide additional information on what mural is being proposed.
  - *Response: Please reference architectural comment response letter.*

## PWSD REVIEW

### Comments

1. Due to the additional of the fire hydrant please submit an executed Standard Improvement Agreement with all required exhibits.
  - *Response: Noted. Standard Improvement Agreement has been started and will be submitted at a later date.*
2. A wet stamped and signed Engineers Estimate with a 20% contingency must be submitted for verification and District approval for the fire hydrant materials. The approved document will be an Exhibit for the Standard Improvement Agreement and Letter of Credit.
  - *Response: Noted. Engineering estimate is in the process of being drafted and will be submitted at a later date.*
3. A sampling manhole will be required just downstream of the grease interceptor. The domestic service line does not need to tie into the sampling manhole only the grease line from the outlet of the interceptor needs to be sampled. See redline plans.
  - *Response: Sanitary line and sampling manhole have been updated per the provided mark ups.*
4. All easements must be called out and shown on the plans as well as the Plat. The District requires fire hydrants to be in a 20-foot exclusive PWSD easement. ALL easements must be done by separate document (on the District's standard Easement Agreement) regardless if they are done by Plat. Please call out a 20ft easement for the proposed fire hydrant and its 6" DIP lateral (see redline plans).
  - *Response: 20' exclusive PWSD Esmt is now called out on all sheets. Easement will be dedicated per a separate document.*
5. PWSD charges a different rate for irrigation water vs domestic water. If you are planning a combo tap please call out an exterior ¾" irrigation meter pit that tees off the 1.5" Domestic tap (see redlines plans). PWSD will allow the ¾" IRR line to be upsized to a 1" after the ¾" meter.
  - *Response: Irrigation meter has been updated per the provided mark ups.*
6. Please note engineering review fees, domestic Tap fees, easement documents, SIA and letter of credit or cash in lieu are required to be paid or submitted to PWSD prior to plan approval.
  - *Response: Noted, thank you. Please inform how we will receive this amount (invoice?).*

## Red Lines

1. All PWSD fire hydrants and laterals are required to have a 20 ft PWSD easement. 10ft to each side and 5 ft behind the hydrant.
  - *Response: Easement has been added and called out.*
2. ¾" IRR meter pit, ¾" curbstop, and 1.5" x ¾" tee
  - *Response: Irrigation meter, curb stop and tee have been added and called out.*
3. Only grease interceptor needs to be sampled with manhole. See diagram to the right.
  - *Response: Sampling manhole has been updated per the provided detail.*

We appreciate your review and approval of these plans. Please contact me at 719-284-7275 or [Jessica.McCallum@kimley-horn.com](mailto:Jessica.McCallum@kimley-horn.com) should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.



Jessica McCallum, P.E.  
Project Manager