



May 6, 2020

Alex Mestdagh
Engineering Services Manager
20120 E. Mainstreet, Parker, CO 80138
Parker, CO 80138

RE: Douglas 234, Filing No. 6 (SUB29-002) – Town Engineering 1st Review Comment Responses

Mr. Mestdagh,

Please accept this letter as our response to 1st review comments on the Douglas 234, Filing No. 6 application (SUB29-002). Responses to comments are included in blue beneath the original comments.

Traffic and Roadway Review Comments

G General Comments

- G1. On future submittals, please separate the Civil CD's, Utility CD's, Plat, and Site Plan into separate documents.
RESPONSE: We have revised the plans into separate documents as requested, please see the revised submittal.
- G2. Please note that the public improvements associated with this project will be secured via a Subdivision Improvement Agreement. On future submittals, provide a public improvements cost estimate per the template in Appendix B of the RECCM.
RESPONSE: We have prepared a public improvement cost estimate as requested and have included it with this submittal for review/approval.
- G3. Note that no certificates of occupancy, temporary or otherwise, will be granted until Filing 5 has received probationary acceptance and all necessary onsite improvements have been constructed and accepted by the Town
RESPONSE: Acknowledged.

M Minor Development Plat Comments

- M4. Add the following notes to the plat:

“ACCESS EASMENT ARE HEREBY GRANTED OVER ALL PRIVATE ENTRANCES AND INTERNAL ROADWAYS WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT FOR THE BENEFIT OF ALL CURRENT AND FUTURE OWNERS OF THESE PROPERTIES FOR INGRESS, EGRESS AND TRAFFIC CIRCULATION. SHOULD PROPERTIES BE FURTHER SUBDIVIDED INTO ADDITIONAL LOTS, ALL SUCH LOTS SHALL HAVE THE RIGHT TO USE ALL SUCH ENTRANCES AND ROADWAYS FOR PUBLIC ACCESS PURPOSES.”

“NO CERTIFICATES OF OCCUPANCY, TEMPORARY OR OTHERWISE WILL BE ISSUED UNTIL ALL PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS AND NECESSARY ONSITE IMPROVEMENTS ARE COMPLETED AND ACCEPTED IN WRITING BY THE TOWN.”

“NO CERTIFICATES OF OCCUPANCY, TEMPORARY OR OTHERWISE SHALL BE ISSUED UNTIL THE LANDSCAPING IS INSTALLED AND APPROVED BY THE TOWN OR AS OTHERWISE ALLOWED IN THE LAND DEVELOPMENT CODE.”

“PRIVATE ACCESS DRIVES/ROADWAYS MUST BE CONSTRUCTED PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF TEMPORARY CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY AND/OR CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY FOR ANY DEVELOPMENT OCCURRING ON PROPERTY SHOWN HEREIN.”

“PROPERTIES IN THIS PLAT ARE SUBJECT TO A PERPTUAL, NON-EXCLUSIVE CROSS PARKING EASEMENT FOR THE SHARED USE OF ALL PARKING SPACES SITUATED WITH THE PROPERTIES SHOWN HEREIN. THE OWNER OF EACH LOT SHALL KEEP AND MAINTAIN THE PARKING SPACES CONTAINED WITHIN THERE RESPECTIVE LOT IN A COMMERCIALY REASONABLE CONDITION AND STATE OF REPAIR.”

RESPONSE: We have added these notes to the Minor Development Plat.

- M5. Show full sight triangles at the private drive intersections with Hess and Red Sky and add the following note to the plat:

"WITHIN THE SIGHT TRIANGLES, AS SHOWN, LIMITED LANDSCAPING SHALL BE ALLOWED BUT NO SOLID STRUCTURES OR TREES WILL BE PERMITTED. SOLID STRUCTURES SHALL INCLUDE, BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO, FENCES, MAILBOXES, AND UTILITY BOXES. LANDSCAPING WITHIN THE SIGHT TRIANGLES WILL BE LIMITED TO SHRUBS AND PLANTINGS THAT AT MATURITY WILL BE NO TALLER THAN TWO FEET. LANDSCAPING WITHIN THE SIGHT TRIANGLE SHALL BE MAINTAINED BY THE PROPERTY OWNER OR APPROPRIATE ASSOCIATION."

RESPONSE: We have added this note to the Minor Development Plat.

- M6. 25-foot drainage easements will be required to be dedicated over all proposed storm sewer. In areas with multiple utilities, the Town will also accept a 50-foot multi-use easement accompanied by the following note:

“A MULTI-USE UTILITY EASEMENT IS HEREBY DEDICATED AS SHOWN FOR THE USE OF ALL UTILITIES. THE TOWN OF PARKER IS GRANTED ACCESS OVER AND ACROSS THE EASEMENT FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACCESSING, MAINTAINING, AND REPAIRING STORMWATER MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS IN THE EVENT THAT THE PROPERTY OWNER FAILS TO SATISFACTORILY MAINTAIN OR REPAIR SAID FACILITIES.”

RESPONSE: We have added this note to the Minor Development Plat.

- M7. Please coordinate with the Town regarding the dedication of access easements between the commercial lots. Shared accesses are the preferred configuration as they minimize the number of access points while increasing the effective area of each lot. However, this is not a requirement.

RESPONSE: We have coordinated with the Applicant who would prefer to leave the shared access coordination to future lot owners.

M8. Dedicate an access easement over Rosebud Drive.

RESPONSE: We have dedicated a public access easement across Rosebud Drive, now named Sliceroo Drive. Please see the revised Minor Development Plat

R Road and Storm Construction Plan Comments

R9. Remove the "Approved One Year From Date" signature block from the cover sheet.

RESPONSE: We have removed the signature block as requested.

R10. Provide existing and proposed cross slopes on the intersection detail sheets at 25-foot intervals.

RESPONSE: We have added existing and proposed cross slope labels to the intersection detail sheets as requested, see revised plans attached.

R11. Add Private Road No Town Maintenance signs to each end of the private drive.

RESPONSE: We have added the requested "Private Road No Town Maintenance" signs at each entrance.

R12. Please separate the Rosebud Drive plan and profile and storm sewer plan and profile into their own sheets and ensure the private drive ties into the cross slopes of Hess Road and Red Sky Drive properly.

RESPONSE: We have separated the roadway and storm profiles onto separate sheets, please see revised plans attached. We have added additional cross slopes and existing condition information to the intersection grading details and have revised the roadway profile with this submittal.

U Utility Plans Comments

U13. Add the following note to the Overall Utility Plan:

"The proposed utility connection will require a Town right-of-way permit prior to commencing work. The Town prefers connections to be bored to the extent possible, and any street cut allowed by the Town will be required to be patched according to the Town's construction standards and details. The limits of patching will be determined by the Town at the time of construction. The Town of Parker does not allow roadway closures for utility work."

RESPONSE: We have added the note as requested.

S Site Plan Comments

S14. Show storm sewer on the landscape plan and ensure there are no trees proposed within 7-feet of the storm sewer.

RESPONSE: We have added the storm sewer to the landscape plans and have moved trees 7' from storm sewers. Please see revised landscape plans attached.

- S15. Show the sight triangle at the Chambers Road – Red Sky Drive intersection and ensure no landscape or solid structures are proposed within.

RESPONSE: We have added the sight triangles to the landscape plans and have moved all trees from the easement.

T Traffic Study Comments

- T16. Trip Generation: Project Description, Table 3. Further discussion with Town Staff is needed regarding the quantity of development proposed. While a conservative approach to the Traffic Study is appreciated, a Floor Area Ratio of 0.5 is unlikely to be achievable on this site or supported by the market study associated with the Chambers Subarea plan.

RESPONSE: We will provide responses to these traffic related comments with the pending traffic study resubmittal which will be submitted in the next week per coordination with Town staff.

- T17. Trip Distribution: Exhibit 5:

- a. The overall map shows trip distribution for short term, but no long term distribution exhibit was found in the study. Chambers Road south of Hess will carry significant traffic in the future. Please review short and long term distribution with Engineering.
- b. Map callout has 30% of site traffic from the east bypassing the first entry from Hess into the site and going around to the Chambers/Red Sky entry. Please revisit this assumption and discuss with Town staff.
- c. 10% of the site traffic is assumed to come to/from the neighborhoods. Not sure there is a critical mass of residences to support 1200 trips a day. If this 10% assumes cut thru traffic to site from outside areas, may need to review assumed paths and mitigation.

RESPONSE: We will provide responses to these traffic related comments with the pending traffic study resubmittal which will be submitted in the next week per coordination with Town staff.

- T18. Project Volumes: Exhibit 8. While percentages were shown in Exhibit 5 entering/exiting the neighborhood, no project volumes are shown on Swift Fox or Firefly in Exhibit 8. Please update and provide calculation of added traffic.

RESPONSE: We will provide responses to these traffic related comments with the pending traffic study resubmittal which will be submitted in the next week per coordination with Town staff.

- T19. Please review volumes from intersection to intersection to ensure the analysis matches up. For example, Exhibit 12 seems to add eastbound trips to the analysis between Chambers and the roundabout and lose westbound trips based on the movements shown at each intersection.

RESPONSE: We will provide responses to these traffic related comments with the pending traffic study resubmittal which will be submitted in the next week per coordination with Town staff.

- T20. Driveway analysis – Hess Rd RIRO to/from project site. It appears that the driveway analysis assumed converting the continuous acceleration/deceleration lane to a mandatory right (drop) condition. This will need to be reviewed. Prior assumption was this outside lane would be a shared/thru+right condition to meet accel/decel lengths for adjacent established intersections.
RESPONSE: We will provide responses to these traffic related comments with the pending traffic study resubmittal which will be submitted in the next week per coordination with Town staff.
- T21. AM peak analysis: the AM Peak has two different high traffic periods. From 24-Hr count, 8-9 AM is highest raw volume on Red Sky. This corresponds to adjacent elementary school site traffic. From TMC at Chambers/Red Sky, it appears Chambers is highest hourly volume at 7-8 PM. Both periods should be analyzed to ensure all impacts are accounted for.
RESPONSE: We will provide responses to these traffic related comments with the pending traffic study resubmittal which will be submitted in the next week per coordination with Town staff.
- T22. PM peak analysis: the PM Peak also has two different high traffic periods. From 24-Hr count, 3-4 PM is highest raw volume on Red Sky. This corresponds to adjacent elementary school site traffic. From TMC at Chambers/Red Sky, it appears Chambers is highest hourly volume at 5-6 PM. Both periods should be analyzed to ensure all impacts are accounted for.
RESPONSE: We will provide responses to these traffic related comments with the pending traffic study resubmittal which will be submitted in the next week per coordination with Town staff.
- T23. Queue analysis/geometrics: Table 8. Table 8 shows 266' storage recommendation for WB approach to Chambers on Red Sky. It appears only 180' of left turn storage is available before access to right turn is choked off. Please review operation. Microsimulation may be necessary to verify traffic does not back up into the traffic circle.
RESPONSE: We will provide responses to these traffic related comments with the pending traffic study resubmittal which will be submitted in the next week per coordination with Town staff.
- T24. The traffic study is not in standard Town format including signed checklist. Please see Roadway Design and Construction Criteria for details.
RESPONSE: We will provide responses to these traffic related comments with the pending traffic study resubmittal which will be submitted in the next week per coordination with Town staff.
- T25. Analysis detail volumes should match detail sheets. For example, it appears at Chambers/Red Sky NB in the long term + project they used the wrong volume for right turn (looks like analysis used AM right for PM).
RESPONSE: We will provide responses to these traffic related comments with the pending traffic study resubmittal which will be submitted in the next week per coordination with Town staff.

T26. With a traffic signal warranted long-term at the intersection of Chambers Road and Red Sky, this development will be required to pay its share of the cost to design and construct the signal.

RESPONSE: We will provide responses to these traffic related comments with the pending traffic study resubmittal which will be submitted in the next week per coordination with Town staff.

T27. Final study will need PE stamp and signature.

RESPONSE: We will provide responses to these traffic related comments with the pending traffic study resubmittal which will be submitted in the next week per coordination with Town staff.

Stormwater Review Comments

R Road and Storm Construction Plan Comments

R28. Storm Drainage infrastructure Notes on sheet 5 appear to be out of date. Include current notes provided in the SDECM on Town's website (<http://parkeronline.org/577/storm-drainage-and-environmental-criteria>)

RESPONSE: We have updated the notes per the latest version of the SDECM, please see revised notes on Sheet 2.

R29. Provide profiles for each of the lot and area inlet laterals

RESPONSE: We have added the missing inlet lateral plan and profiles, see revised construction plans.

R30. Provide minor and major HGLs for the entire length of proposed RCP and not just the structures.

RESPONSE: We have updated the HGLs based on design changes and have extended the lines for the entire length of the pipe runs and not just at structures.

R31. Provide the type and size of all drainage structures in both plan and profile. EX: 5' Type R or 6' MH.

RESPONSE: We have labeled the type and size in both plan and profile views as requested.

R32. Provide a key map for the storm laterals on Sheet 19.

RESPONSE: We have added key maps to the storm lateral sheets as requested.

D Drainage Report Comments

D33. Reference within the report and include in the appendix the relevant Pond A contributing/assumed sub-basin characteristics, pond calculations, and drainage maps from the Parker 234 report.

RESPONSE: We have updated the report to include the Pond A information as requested.

Grading and Erosion Control Plan Comments

G General Comments

- G34. Rename the Phase A and Phase B CBMP plan sheets to be initial CBMP plan and interim/final CBMP plan.
RESPONSE: We have renamed the plans as requested, see revised plans attached.
- G35. Provide a legend of symbols to correspond to the Town's 31 CBMP Notes & Details.
RESPONSE: We have revised symbols and legends to comply with the Town's 31 CBMP notes and details, see revised plans.
- G36. Revise note 4 to read as follows:
"LOT PROTECTION (LP) IS REQUIRED ON COMMERCIAL LOTS WHEN LANDSCAPING IS NOT POSSIBLE."
RESPONSE: We confirmed this comment relates to Note 3, and have revised note 3 as requested.

I Initial CBMP Plan Comments

- I37. Remove reference to any non-initial phase CBMPs such as rough cut street control (RCSC) and inlet protection for future/proposed inlets.
RESPONSE: We have removed the references to interim/final CBMPs as requested.
- I38. Provide and identify the vehicle tracking control (VTC), stabilized staging area (SSA), and portable toilet protection (PTP). The contractor may adjust and/or relocate these controls as coordinated with the environmental inspector prior to construction. Revise note 7 to have any CBMP changes coordinated through the Town's environmental inspector.
RESPONSE: We have added the VTC, SSA and PTP controls as requested. We have revised note 7 to require any CBMP changes to be coordinated through the Town's environmental inspector.
- I39. Revise the IPAN for the existing area inlet adjacent to the single-family lots to graphically show on top of the existing inlet.
RESPONSE: We have revised the IPAN to be on top of the existing inlet.
- I40. Provide a callout at the two driveway cuts that states the following:
"AL WORK WITHIN PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY (ROW) WILL REQUIRE A TOWN ROW PERMIT. INITIAL AND INTERIM CBMPs FOR WORK WITHIN THE TOWN'S ROW SHALL BE COORDINATED WITH THE TOWN'S ENVIRONMENTAL INSPECTOR PRIOR TO THE BEGINNING OF ANY ROW WORK."
RESPONSE: We have added the call out as requested.

F Interim/Final CBMP Plan Comments

- I41. In addition to the identified back of walk protection, provide sediment control log (SCL) in the tree lawn along the back of curb. Erosion control blanket (ECB) may be utilized over the entire tree lawn in-lieu of the additional SCL.
RESPONSE: We have added a sediment control log in the tree lawn area behind the back of curb. Additionally, we have added a note to the interim/final plan sheet stating that ECB may be utilized over the entire tree lawn in-lieu of the SCL, please see the revised plans.
- I42. Show the swales identified on the grading plan as diversion ditches (DD) on the interim/final CBMP plan.
RESPONSE: We have added the diversion ditches to the grading plan
- I43. Provide and identify debris and trash control (DTC) along Hess Road, Chambers Road, and Red Sky Drive.
RESPONSE: We have added the DTC to the roadways.
- I44. Provide sidewalk transition protection (STP) for the proposed curb ramps on Hess Road.
RESPONSE: We have added STP to all curb ramps, see revised plans.
- I45. Revise the curb inlet protection along Hess Road and the private drive from IPCOS to IPCOG. The IPCOG CBMP includes both the protection at the inlet lip as well as the upstream rock socks.
RESPONSE: We have revised the curb protection to IPCOG along Hess Road.
- I46. Identify the RCSC on the interim/final CBMP plan.
RESPONSE: We have added the RCSC to the private drive on the interim/final plan.
- I47. Include surface roughening (SR) over the lots in addition to the provided seeding, mulching, and crimping (SMC).
RESPONSE: We have added SR and SMC to the lots in addition to the seeding & mulching.

Please let me know if you have any questions concerning this response letter and/or the enclosed documents.

Sincerely,

RICK ENGINEERING COMPANY

Jack Scanlon, PE
Principal Project Engineer

cc: Andrew Trietley, Ventana Capital

Enclosure