

August 16, 2024

Stacey Nerger, Senior Planner
Town of Parker Planning Department
Town Hall
20120 East Mainstreet
Parker, CO 80138



Site Plan Amendment
Crown Point, 30th Amendment
Lot 1, Tract A & B
Parker, CO 80138

RE: Site Plan Amendment Review Round 1 dated 7/15/24

Dear Stacey,

Thank you for your plan review comments for the above-mentioned project. Please find our response to those comments below and in the updated documents and drawings resubmitted. For information, the original plan review comment is shown below in black, with the design team response in blue. Should you need any additional clarification, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Town of Parker Planning Review Comments & Responses

Please see the pages attached at the end of this letter that include responses to all planning staff comments in the format in which they were received.

Town of Parker Engineering Review Comments & Responses

Traffic and Roadway Review Comments: Construction Plans – Civil

1. Please adjust the heading to conform to standard formatting. (See redline comments)
- **RESPONSE:** The heading has been adjusted on all sheets as noted.
1. The Vicinity Map shall be at a scale of 1"=2,000' and include location and names of all aerial roadways within one mile of proposed construction. Include any major drainageways in this area.
- **RESPONSE:** The scale has been adjusted to 1"=2,000' and the names of roadways have been included.

1426 Pearl Street, Suite 300, Boulder, Colorado 80302
O: 303.499.7795

2. Please include contact information (company, address, phone and Contact) for Developer, Engineer, Town of Park, and Utilities on the Cover sheet. Please provide all sheets formatted to the Town's standards as required per the Town's Roadway Design and Construction Criteria Manual (RDCCM). Please reference section 2.3 of the RDCCM for the required construction plan submittal requirements.
 - **RESPONSE:** Contact information has been added to the cover as requested, and the formatting revised.
3. Please include a Key Map for sheets that consist of plan views showing a portion of the overall site (see redline comments).
 - **RESPONSE:** A key map has been included on the split sheets.
4. Please label all private driveway/roadway as "Private" throughout the plans.
 - **RESPONSE:** The language has been revised as noted.
5. Per Section 3.7 of the RDCCM: Spot elevations for top and bottom (at grade) of all retaining walls shall be shown on the grading plans. Retaining walls four feet high, from the bottom of the foundation to the top of the wall, or greater require a building permit. Plans shall be submitted to and approved by the Building Department prior to construction.
 - **RESPONSE:** We have added two new grading plan sheets to show basic grading and detailed wall elevations.

Traffic and Roadway Review Comments: Site Plan – Civil

1. Please adjust the heading to conform to standard formatting.
 - **RESPONSE:** The heading has been adjusted on all sheets as noted.
1. The Vicinity Map shall be at a scale of 1"=2,000' and include location and names of all aerial roadways within one mile of proposed construction. Include any major drainageways in this area.
 - **RESPONSE:** The scale has been adjusted to 1"=2,000' and the names of roadways have been included.
2. Please update the Parker contact information on the cover sheet (see uploaded redline comments).
 - **RESPONSE:** Contact information has been added to the cover as requested, and the formatting revised.
3. Please label all private driveway/roadway as "Private" throughout the plans.
 - **RESPONSE:** The labels have been clarified

4. Please include sight triangles in the landscape plan. While the Town does not regulate sight distance for access points along private roadways, it is highly recommended by Town staff that sight lines in accordance with Town standard detail 24 be evaluated by design staff to ensure safe ingress and egress from the property. It is also important to note that sight triangles for private access points onto private roadways is the responsibility of the property owner to maintain.
- **RESPONSE:** [Sight Triangles have been added to the landscape plans.](#)
5. Please note the minimum offset distance of any trees to edge of storm pipe/inlet is 7 feet per SDECM Section 6.3.3.2.
- **RESPONSE:** [Understood. Trees and utilities have adjusted to accommodate this.](#)

Traffic and Roadway Review Comments: Traffic Impact Study – Civil

1. Final approval of the Traffic Impact Assessment Letter will require the traffic engineer's signature and seal.
- **RESPONSE:** [Please see the attached stamped and signed Traffic Impact Assessment Letter dated 08/16/2024. This also includes the additional 2 floors that have been added after the round 1 submittal.](#)

Environmental Review Comments: Construction Plans

1. Please add a general note stating – “TO REDUCE THE POTENTIAL FOR CLOGGING OF DEBRIS GRATES, NO STRAW MULCH SHALL BE USED WITHIN THE EXCESS URBAN RUNOFF VOLUME OF A DETENTION BASIN. INSTEAD, EROSION CONTROL BLANKET SHALL BE INSTALLED FOR A WIDTH OF AT LEAST 6-FEET ON BOTH SIDES OF THE CONCRETE LOW FLOW CHANNELS OR UP TO A DEPTH OF 1-FOOT IN SOIL RIPRAP OR BENCHED LOW FLOW CHANNELS. ADDITIONALLY, HYDRAULICALLY APPLIED WOOD FIBER MULCH, STABILIZED FIBER MATRIX, BONDED FIBER MATRIX, OR FLEXIBLE GROWTH MEDIUM SHALL BE USED IN ALL OTHER AREAS WITHIN THE EXCESS URBAN RUNOFF VOLUME OF THE DETENTION BASIN. THE BLANKET AND HYDRAULICALLY APPLIED MULCH SHALL COMPLY WITH THE MATERIALS AND INSTALLATION REQUIREMENTS FOR EROSION CONTROL BLANKETS AS REQUIRED BY THE TOWN'S CBMP PROGRAM, AND WHERE APPLICABLE, THE PRODUCT MANUFACTURER.”
- **RESPONSE:** [This note has been added to sheet C001](#)
2. Please consider connecting the Stabilized Staging Area (SSA) to the Vehicle Tracking Control (VTC) as shown in the Town's standard detail. This configuration helps limit the amount of necessary traffic across disturbed areas, further limiting tracking from the site.

- **RESPONSE:** Great suggestion, we've incorporated this change.
3. Please remove the duplicate set of the Town of Parker's CBMP Legend, General Notes & CBMP Details.
- **RESPONSE:** I believe this was a compilation error, and has been amended in this package.
4. Please provide and identify Detention Pond Protection (DP) as a precautionary measure for the two detention ponds.
- **RESPONSE:** Detention Pond Protection has been added.
- Initial CBMP Plans: Please show jersey barriers or construction fence along the sides of the VTC to ensure use of the entire 50-foot pad.
- **RESPONSE:** The plan has been revised as noted.
5. Interim/Final CBMP Plans: Provide and identify Erosion Control Blanket (ECB) for all slopes 4:1 or steeper. Specifically, the south side of the proposed expansion.
- **RESPONSE:** ECB has been added for all areas over 4:1 slope. We do not have any areas over 3:1.

Stormwater Review Comments: Construction Plans

1. The drainage report that was submitted with the Site Plan Application states the existing orifice restrictor plate will be replaced on both the South Pond B and Southwest Pond A. Provide details for proposed improvements to the ponds and location with labels to said ponds on a map within the construction plans.
- **RESPONSE:** Clear callouts have been added to the grading plans within the CDs (C211 and C212) as well as references to the detail sheet.
2. Please provide details for storm structures and provide reference to detail sheet.
- **RESPONSE:** Orifice details have been provided as a part of this package.
3. Please include a Key Map for sheets that consist of plan views showing a portion of the overall site.
- **RESPONSE:** A key map has been added as requested.
4. Drainage easements granting the Town legal access to all stormwater facilities located outside the public right-of-way is a requirement to ensure proper construction and maintenance (excluding landscaping and roof drains). Easements by separate document may be necessary when drainage

facilities are proposed to be constructed on previously platted parcels. Please see Table 2.8 of the SDECM for proposed easement requirements. Please show existing and proposed drainage easements. Existing drainage easements should include reference to reception number.

- **RESPONSE:** Drainage easements have been added visually and will be processed as a part of the larger replat. We contacted CWSD and are awaiting comments from Cottonwood Water and Sanitation District before the formal replat process.

5. Please see Table 6.3 of the SDECM. Laterals from inlets must be minimum 18" RCP.

- **RESPONSE:** The lateral sizes have been revised to 18" everywhere.

Stormwater Review Comments: Drainage Report

- Please use latest NOAA Atlas 14 point rainfall values for Town of Parker in Hydrology calculations and provide reference to the data used in this report. Parker is in the process of updating the SDECM to reflect this in requirement.
- **RESPONSE:** The rainfall data has been revised as noted.
- Please use the latest MHFD recommended imperviousness from the latest version of Table 6-2 and 6-3 of the USDCM_Volume_1 for updated basins.
- **RESPONSE:** Impervious values have been revised to match the latest tables.
- Please describe Offsite Basins, relative drainage patterns and why they are excluded.
- **RESPONSE:** This has been addressed via additional text within Section III of the drainage report.
- Please clarify whether this workbook calculation (see redline comments) includes offsite basins.
- **RESPONSE:** Each calculation is more clearly marked in the revised drainage report.
- The minor and major storm event ratio of peak outflow to pre-development flow should be closer to 1. (See redline comments)
- **RESPONSE:** The calculations have been revised to more closely model this condition. We are aiming to leave the existing outlet structures largely in place which results in slight over-detention in areas.
- Please help staff understand the purpose for multiple detention storage calculations submitted with inclusion and exclusion of off-site basins. Please clearly indicate which of the proposed calculations for

orifice plate modification corresponds to what is proposed to be constructed and provide details that align with the proposed orifice plate configuration in the construction plans.

- **RESPONSE:** The multiple calculations (with offsite basins and without) are meant to show that the ponds function in either condition with the proposed orifice design. The model excluding the offsite basins was used to size the orifices, and the model including the offsite basins represents the post-construction conditions of the site. Doing it this way avoids the over-inflated allowable release rates that come as a result of the additional tributary area, and better represent a future condition where the site to the south is no longer tributary to the pond. We are including both models to show that the ponds function in either condition.
 - Please evaluate the design calculations of modified Pond B accommodates the 1-foot of freeboard requirement.
- **RESPONSE:** The model has been revised, and the freeboard has returned thanks to an increased outfall ratio.
 - The minimum required freeboard for detention facilities is 1.0-foot above the computed water surface elevation assuming the outlet is blocked and the emergency spillway is conveying the future development 100-year undetained discharge (or the maximum design flow, whichever is greater).
- **RESPONSE:** The model has been revised, and the freeboard has returned thanks to an increased outfall ratio.
 - Please provide a summary table of results for inlet capacity and ponding depths with inlet labels. The results from the graph appear to differ significantly from what is shown in StormCAD results. (See redline comments)
- **RESPONSE:** The inlet capacities are now shown via MHFD calculation. The depth shown within the StormCAD table represents the height of the HGL above the sump of the structure rather than the depth of ponding water at the surface of the inlet.
 - Please clarify if this is a duplicate analysis for 100-YR of StormCAD results or if this is the 5-YR design storm analysis. (See redline comments)
- **RESPONSE:** This was duplicated and has been corrected in the revised submittal.
 - Please provide design calculations showing adherence to spread width and depth criteria for storm runoff at inlets. Please see Table 2.4 and 2.5 for allowable use of streets for initial and major storm runoff. Please use the MHFD inlet capacity and spread calculations workbook.
- **RESPONSE:** The MHFD inlet capacity calculations have been provided.

- Please include a Key Map for maps that consist of plan views showing a portion of the overall site (see redline comments).
- **RESPONSE:** Key maps have been added.
- It would be helpful to schedule a virtual meeting or phone discussion to help clarify some items in the drainage report to help staff better understand the design and the intent of some of the calculations within the drainage report. Please reach out to setup a time for discussion. (Email Charles at ckudlauskas@parkerco.gov)
- **RESPONSE:** Thank you for your time coordinating the comments with us. We will be happy to review again, if necessary but hope we have achieved clarity.

CORE Review Comments & Responses

Site Plan Comments

- Sheet 05 of 19: EXISTING CORE UG (CONFLICT WITH NEW EXPANSION)
- **RESPONSE:** We recognize the conflict with the existing underground line, and have proposed a re-route to the east of the proposed building, shown on the utility plan.

Thank you again, and we look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Megan Burns, AIA
Boulder Associates, Inc.
Associate