

Compark Village South Filing 2  
Submittal Comments from Trakit "Reviews" tab  
CLCPKC3.05/SUB16-034  
Updated as of 11/19/16

**1. Completeness Review – Patrick Mulready**

NO COMMENTS UPLOADED. STATUS: APPROVED.

**2. Address Plat 20 – Steve Greer**

NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.

**3. Centennial Airport – Aaron Repp**

10/28/2016 11:29:49 AM Re: SUB16-034; COMPARK VILLAGE SOUTH F2 FINAL PLAT.

Dear Mr. Mulready,

Thank you for the opportunity to review the Final Plat SUB16-034. Due to the location of the proposed development and its close proximity to the Airport, the Arapahoe County Public Airport Authority strongly opposes this development. We have the following comments to make on the project:

- The proposed development lies approximately 5,500 feet from the nearest runway at Centennial Airport and within the Restricted Development Area (RDA). The site lies directly adjacent to the Approach Zone (AZ) of the Airport Influence Area (AIA). Based on the Airport's Land Use Guidelines, all new noise sensitive developments are not recommended within the RDA. Due to the proximity of the Airport the development will be subjected to numerous aircraft over flights at low altitudes and their associated effects. These effects include, but are not limited to: noise, smoke, dust, fumes and vibrations.
- A 7-day noise test is recommended using single noise event levels (SEL) for developments at this site. It is highly recommended for any development, if approved, that the internal noise be attenuated to 45 DNL or less.
- Due to the high number of operations at Centennial Airport, aircraft will inevitably fly over this site numerous times a day. An Avigation Easement and Overflight Disclosure Statement for future residents is highly recommended prior to the start of construction and once filed, please forward a copy of the executed avigation easement and disclosure statement to our office.
- Any objects on the site (including cranes used during construction) that penetrate a 100:1 slope from the nearest point of the nearest runway, penetrates the FAA Part 77 airspace surface, impede signals associated with

navigational equipment or any other reason the FAA deems necessary will require the filing and approval of FAA Form 7460-1. This form may take 90 days or more for approval. Please visit <https://oeaaa.faa.gov> to utilize the notice criteria tool to confirm filing requirements and to file the FAA Form 7460-1. Please note that this is a State and Federal regulatory requirement. Our calculations show that a Form 7460-1 will be required for both the building and associated cranes. In addition, please have crane operators advise the airport prior to erecting any cranes.

**Comment noted.**

**4. CenturyLink Communications 20 – William Benson**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

**5. Cherry Creek Basin Water Quality Authority 20 – Chuck Reid**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

**6. Comcast 20 – Scott Moore**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

**7. Construction Plans – Civil – Tyler Sandt**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

**8. Construction Plans – Environmental – Kurt Patrick**

Erosion and Sediment Control Plans

CBMP plans need to account for phase 1 and phase 2 being built at different times. Need to show perimeter control separating phase 1 and phase 2 and access points from phase 1 into phase 2 with VTCs.

**Response: The CBMP plans have been revised to show separate perimeter controls and a new VTC for Phase 2.**

**9. Construction Plans – Stormwater – Jacob James**

Storm Drainage Plan and Profiles

It would appear some of the roads are not in compliance with Town specifications regarding maximum allowable gutter capacity (*Storm Drainage and Environmental Criteria Manual, Table 6.1*). Please revisit these areas.

**Response: Each of the proposed drainage areas has been evaluated to ensure the gutter capacity and inlet capacity do not exceed those allowed by the Storm Drainage and Environmental Criteria Manual and the Roadway Design and Construction Criteria Manual.**

## **10. Construction Plans – Traffic – David Aden**

### General Comments

On future submittals, please include a landscape plan. Ensure no trees or landscape above two feet is placed within the sight triangles and that no trees are placed within seven feet of any storm sewer pipe.

**Response: The landscape plans have been submitted previously. Updated plans have been uploaded with this submittal.**

Revise Note 8 on the Final Plat as shown below:

*“Public access easements are hereby dedicated as shown on this plat and across Tracts B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, and K for the purposes of ingress and egress of vehicles, including emergency vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles. The underlying property owner or assigns is responsible for the maintenance of the easement area.”*

**Response: Note 8 on the Final Plat has been revised.**

Revise the drainage easement language in the plat to be shown as: *“dedicated by this plat”* in order to allow vacation by the Amendment 1 plat.

**Response: The drainage easement language on the plat has been revised.**

### Construction Documents

It appears that at the intersection of Meadowlark Lane and Bald Eagle Street as well as the intersection of Meadowlark Lane and Golden Eagle Street, flow from undeveloped areas will flow onto the paved streets between phases one and two. Please clarify how these flows will be mitigated in the interim.

**Response: CBMP's will be installed when the drainage infrastructure is constructed in Phase 1. They will be maintained until all areas flowing to the drainage infrastructure are permanently stabilized.**

At the intersection of Meadowlark Lane and Gray Jay Street, it appears flow from developed roads will flow onto undeveloped areas and into the proposed storm sewer. Please clarify how these flows will be mitigated in the interim.

**Response: All of the drainage infrastructure for this project will be installed in Phase 1. Flows from developed roads will not leave the roadway and will be collected by the proposed drainage infrastructure.**

On future submittals, include curb radii on the intersection details sheets.

**Response: Curb radii have been added to the intersection detail sheets**

On sheet 33 of the Roadway and Drainage CD's, it appears there was some sort of formatting issue regarding the colors.

**Response: The pen configuration has been revised.**

**11. Douglas County School District RE-1 20 – Steve Ormiston**

**ATTACHED LETTER. COMMENTS NOTED.**

**12. Drainage Report – Civil – Tyler Sandt**

Final Drainage Report

On future submittals, please include the “Inlet Management” sheet from the Urban Drainage Street and Inlet Hydraulics workbook.

**Response: Per a conversation with Tyler Sandt the “Inlet Management” sheet is not required since the project was submitted prior to creation of the “Inlet Management” sheet.**

**13. Drainage Report – Stormwater – Jacob James**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

**14. E-470 Public Highway Authority 20 – Peggy Davenport**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED. STATUS: COMPLETED**

**15. Final Plat 20 – Patrick Mulready**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

**16. Fire Life Safety 20 – Randy Capra**

Hydrant spacing is not per discussion; additional hydrants shall be added as follows:

- Between Bald Eagle St and Golden Eagle Street, a hydrant shall be added on Red Hawk Lane
- Between Golden Eagle Street and Hummingbird Street, add a hydrant on Red Hawk Lane
- Between Bald Eagle St and Golden Eagle Street, a hydrant shall be added at the corner of lot 12 and at the corner of lot 28.

Ensure that fire hydrants are located per the requirements of the IFC tables B and C and per the requirements of NFPA 24

**Response:**

- The hydrant at the intersection of Bald Eagle St and Red Hawk Lane has been moved to Red Hawk Lane (corner of lots 1 & 2, Block 7) to locate it within 500' of the hydrant at the intersection of Golden Eagle St and Red Hawk Lane.
- A hydrant has been added at the corner of lot 17, Block 7
- There is a hydrant at the corner of lots 6 & 7, Block 5 that did not show up on the previously submitted plans.
- We have reviewed the proposed fire hydrant spacing to verify the maximum 500' spacing has been met.

**17. Grandview Estates HOA 20 – Tina Schwartz**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

**18. Grandview Estates Rural Water Conservation District 20 – Jerri Hill**

We object to the high density of the replat.

13.07.120 - Replat, vacation or plat amendment.

- Signed application is missing the number of single family units (21) and duplex units (72)

**Response: Signed application notes “the purpose of the replat is to plat 21 single family lots and 72 duplex lots and 13 tracts”.**

- Final Plat 1 of 4 –
  - o Dedication commits adjacent land owners to sight easements shown, they have no authority to do that in Grandview Estates.

**Response: Plat notes are standard notes required by the Town of Parker.**

- o Park land dedication is inadequate at 0.896 acres. Municipal code 13.07.140 (c) (2) provides a formula for park acreage in residential areas as follows:

$$PA = (SFU+DU) \times 0.0239 = 93 \times 0.0239 = 2.22 \text{ acres}$$

where PA - Park Acreage, acres, SFU = Single Family Units, DU = Duplex Units

- o Please increase park acreage.

**Response: Park area was approved in preliminary plat submittal.**

- o Lot numbers are not numbered consecutively as required 13.07.120 (e)

**Response: Lot numbers are consecutive within each Block and follow the approved preliminary plat..**

- Final Plat 2 of 4 –
  - Filbert Street should be Filbert Avenue

**Response: The street name has been changed.**

- Sewer and water 2 of 14 general notes cover sheet
  - o Water Main and services Notes 7, Chlorination and flushing, Chlorine concentration should be 50 mg/L, not 50 mg to 1. How will the spent bleach be disposed?

**Response: Installation of the water main and services will be in accordance with Stonegate Village Metropolitan District standards and specifications.**

- Water Plan west 4 of 14
  - o Six fire hydrants available, one for grandview at First Street, none at Second and third Streets, four in Phase I area and one not accounted for.

**Response: The fire hydrants at the end of Second and Third Street will be constructed in Phase 2. Please see the plans for Phase 2 for proposed design.**

#### **19. IREA 20 – Brooks Kaufman**

11/10/2016 11:14:46 AM The Association will request any necessary easements during the Association's design phase.

**Comment noted.**

#### **20. Plat – Civil – Tyler Sandt**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

#### **21. Plat – Stormwater – Jacob James**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

#### **22. Police 20 – Greg Epp**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

#### **23. Public Improvements Cost Estimate – Civil – Tyler Sandt**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

#### **24. Public Service Company of Colorado – Donna George**

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCO) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has

reviewed the final plat for Compark Village South Filing No.2 and requests the dry utility easements be identified and labeled with their widths.

**Response: Easement labels have been added**

PSCo also requests that utility easements are dedicated to the Town of Parker for the benefit of the applicable utility providers for the installation, maintenance, and replacement of electric, gas, television, cable, and telecommunications facilities (Dry Utilities).

**Response: The utility dedication shown is specific to the Town of Parker and cannot be modified.**

Utility easements shall also be granted within any access easements and private streets in the subdivision. Permanent structures, improvements, objects, buildings, wells, water meters and other objects that may interfere with the utility facilities or use thereof (Interfering Objects) shall not be permitted within said utility easements and the utility providers, as grantees, may remove any Interfering Objects at no cost to such grantees, including, without limitation, vegetation. Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCo) and its successors reserve the right to require additional easements and to require the property owner to grant PSCo an easement on its standard form.

**Response: Utility easements have not been granted within any access easements or private streets. Additional utility easements have been added between the lots in Blocks 1 and 2 to service those lots.**

As the project progresses, the property owner/developer/contractor must contact the Builder's Call Line at 1-800-628-2121 or <https://xcelenergy.force.com/FastApp> (Register so you can track your application) and complete the application process for any new gas service. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. Additional easements may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities.

**Response: Comment noted.**

**25. Stonegate Village Metro District 20 – Scott Barnett**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED. STATUS: APPROVED**

**26. Subdivision Improvement Agreement – PW – Alex Mestdagh**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

**27. Traffic Impact Study – David Arden**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

**28. Urban Drainage & Flood Control District 20**

10/27/2016 10:13:54 AM UDFCD offers NO COMMENT regarding the replat. The storm drainage construction plans are considered conceptual in nature and must be resubmitted and reviewed by UDFCD if the City request MEP for this subdivision.

**Comment noted.**

**29. Address Plat 20 – Chris Boyd**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**

**30. South Metro Fire 20 – Amanda Silva**

**NO COMMENTS UPLOADED.**