

November 27, 2024

Mr. Randall L. Capra
Town of Parker – Fire/Life Safety
20120 E. Mainstreet
Parker, Colorado 80138

RE: SP23-006 Crown Point F1 AMD 20 L4E – Land of Sushi
Fire Safety Submittal Comments Response

Dear Mr. Capra,

Please find below our responses to the Fire/Life Safety review comments to the Site Plan Documents facilitate your review, we have included the original comments (key issues and numbered comments) in italicized font and have provided our responses in bold. All previously satisfied comments have been removed.

Site Plans – Fire/Life Safety

3. *There are issues with the unitality; typical comments are provided below. Ensure that the drawings address the following when resubmitting: Partially satisfied; applicant noted or acknowledged or addressed with second submittal. The applicant's only response to the noted requirements was that "plans have been revised to have separate lines to hydrant to the riser room. Added UFL callout to the sheets".* **Not satisfied; the applicant has not addressed or correctly addressed the items called out below as "NOT SATISFIED". When resubmitting, address all issues/items as required... fully. The site plan will not be signed off until all issues are resolved/addressed satisfactorily.**

- *The correct Fire Life Safety signature block is provided on the correct pages; the signature block shall only be provided on the **cover sheet of the Utility Plan set and the Overall Utility page**. This block can be seen at the end of this response letter. Not addressed with second submittal. **Not Addressed with the third submittal. The applicant has not provided the required signature blocks on the two pages noted... the Cover Sheet and the Overall Utility Sheet. When addressing this, do not change the format of the signature block by making it narrower than the block provided. Remove the signature block from all other pages such as the "Storm Plan" in all documents (i.e. CD and Site Plan as applicable.)***

Response: The Fire Review Signature Block was added to the cover sheet and the Overall Utility Plan. It has been removed from all other sheets.

- *The Utility drawings shall clearly identify the UFL by name, length and size on the plan set (a note can address this though the underground fire line itself shall also bear these notations. The measurement shall be made from the "T" at the water main ending at the flange in the fire sprinkler control valve room. Not addressed with second submittal. **Not satisfied with the third submittal. The applicant has not called out the length of the UFL, as measured from the T in the water main to the flange in the building, as required with the first submittal.***



Response: The length of the UFL has been added to the overall utility plan.

3a. *Not Satisfied; the fire hydrant, while located correctly, is shown to have a 45-degree bend in the line. Typically, bends are not allowed. Work through this issue with Cottonwood Water and address when resubmitting.*

Response: We have worked with Cottonwood Water and resolved this issue. The bend in the fire hydrant lateral has been removed.

7. While the applicant has provided an auto turn analysis, the applicant has not addressed the access on the eastern portion of the site. When resubmitting, the applicant shall provide an auto turn analysis indicating that apparatus can **navigate all portions** of this site (east side of the building); NO PARKING – FIRE LANE signage is required for any portion of the access where the 20-foot clear width requirement cannot be met. See below for the areas **required** to be included in the auto turn analysis (in addition to what already has been shown) and address when resubmitting: *Not satisfied; applicant has provided the required area for the analysis though the auto turn shows quite a bit of encroachment into the landscaping on the north end. Clean up the analysis to ensure access when resubmitting. Not satisfied with the third submittal; the applicant may need to remove a couple of parking places on the east side of the parking lot to make the REQUIRED auto-turn analysis work more efficiently. Currently, the analysis indicates that apparatus would need to navigate into parking stalls to make the proposal work. The analysis also does not take into consideration extended cab pickup trucks and vans that would hang out into the required access. Address this issue when resubmitting.*

Response: The analysis has been revised to show that the overhang of the truck does not enter into any parking spaces. The proposed vegetation has been added to the exhibit to show that it does not conflict with the body of the truck.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to review this application. We look forward to working with you towards approval of this development proposal.

Sincerely,
GALLOWAY



Scott Brown
Sr. Technical Civil Project Manager
ScottBrown@GallowayUS.com