

March 25, 2022
Merrick Project No. 65120950

Tyler Sandt & Michael Walton
Town of Parker
Development Review Division
Town Hall - 20120 East Mainstreet
Parker, Colorado 80138

Re: Compark Village South Filing 1 Amendment 2 – Engineering 1st Review

Dear Mr. Sandt & Walton

Merrick & Company has reviewed the comments dated November 9, 2021, regarding the Compark Village South development. The following summarizes Merrick's responses to the comments provided by the Town of Park Development Review Division.

TRAFFIC & ROADWAY REVIEW COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS:

1. Please note that the applicant will be required to meet all conditions outlined in the Annexation Agreement
[Response: Comment Noted.](#)
2. On future submittals, provide a landscape plan. Sight triangles should be shown at public access points and any proposed or existing landscape above two feet in height should be removed or relocated.
[Response: Comment Noted.](#)

REPLAT:

1. Prior to the next submittal, coordinate with the Town on whether a trail easement will be required.
[Response: Since the trail is not a regional trail, an easement is not required.](#)
2. Provide access easements over the private drives.
[Response: Access Easements have been provided.](#)
3. Provide 25-foot drainage easements over all storm sewer outside the right-of-way. Note that this does not include storm sewer that only collects flows from roofs or landscape areas.
[Response: Drainage Easements provided.](#)
4. Show sight triangles on the plat at the public access points (even those that do not require an easement) 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.

Employee Owned



5970 Greenwood Plaza Blvd
Greenwood Village, CO 80111



Tel: +1 303-751-0741



hello@merrick.com
www.merrick.com

Landscaping within the sight triangle shall be maintained by the property owner or appropriate association.”

Response: Sight triangles and note added to plat.

5. 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 IMPROVEMETS 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: Not added to plat.

CONSTUCTION PLANS:

1. Add “Private Road, No Town Maintenance” signs to this site’s public access points.

Response: “Private Road, No Town Maintenance” signs have been added to the site’s public access points.

Traffic Study:

1. On future submittal, provide a Traffic Impact Study for review.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study has been included in the submittal package for review.



Stormwater Review Comments

The following comments concern drainage, erosion and sediment control, and non-point source pollution control issues for the subject property. They are based upon our review of the submittal documents against the criteria presented in the Town of Parker's, *Storm Drainage and Environmental Criteria Manual (SDECM)*, as revised, February, 2014. Additional regulatory and planning documents were utilized in the review, and are referenced in the comments where appropriate.

Road and Storm Plans:

1. All storm sewer systems collecting drainage from the proposed drive aisles and parking areas shall be considered public and must adhere to the standards and specifications outlined within Section 6.3.3 of the Town's SDECM, including the use of RCP and dedication of drainage easements. Landscape drains, roof drains, and leaders for these systems are considered private and may be constructed with plastic pipe and catch basins. These private systems must connect to the public storm sewer system at an inlet or manhole structure. Inserta-tee connections are not allowed.
Response: All storm sewer systems collecting drainage from the proposed drive aisles and parking areas adhere to the standards and specifications outlined within Section 6.3.3 of the Town's SDECM. All storm sewer has been revised from HDPE to RCP where applicable. All private storm sewer systems have been labeled as such and HDPE is being used. All private storm sewer systems connect at a manhole or an inlet, no inserta-tee connections are being proposed.
2. Provide the minor storm Hydraulic Grade Line on all profiles as well.
Response: The minor storm Hydraulic Grade Line has been provided within the storm sewer profiles.
3. SHT 22: Provide depth labels for clearance of the utility crossings.
Response: Depth labels have been provided on storm sewer profiles for all utility crossings.
4. SHT 22: If the outfall pipe to the forebay will be existing by others, revise the style to match the style used for other existing storm sewer in the plans.
Response: The forebay, a portion of the storm sewer, maintenance road, and the trickle channel will be existing and completed by others prior to the construction of the Site. The style has been revised to reflect this.
5. Provide a forebay and trickle channel for the proposed pond outfall which connects to the existing system. Provide a maintenance access path to the newly proposed pond infrastructure.
Response: See response to comment 4 above.
6. Please consider replacing the bends in the proposed landscape/roof drain system with cleanouts for improved maintainability. Please also consider whether the bends proposed in the northern landscape drain line could be further minimized to improve flow conditions through the pipe. Specifically, it appears having some of the landscape drains in line with rather than stubbed out from the mainline could decrease the number of required bends.
Response: The storm sewer system has been revised. The private storm sewer system has added cleanouts and bends to provide easier maintenance access and hydraulic efficiency.



7. Provide a detail for the pond forebay which complies with Figures 7.1 or 7.2 of the Town's SDECM. The detail should provide at a minimum all dimensions, elevations, material, reinforcement, and any other information necessary to construct the forebay in compliance with the drainage report.
[Response: See response to comment 4 above.](#)
8. Provide a detail for the pond trickle channel which complies with Figure 7.3 of the Town's SDECM. The detail should provide a minimum of all dimensions, elevations, material, reinforcement, and any other information necessary to construct the trickle channel in compliance with the drainage report.
[Response: See response to comment 4 above.](#)
9. Provide the Town's maintenance road detail, Figure 7.4 of the Town's SDECM. Identify in plan view the extents of each cross section to be used.
[Response: See response to comment 4 above.](#)
10. Provide CDOT Standard Details for all proposed storm sewer infrastructure. Remove all duplicated details from Douglas County.
[Response: All duplicate DC details have been removed and CDOT details provided.](#)
11. Provide Town's Standard Manhole Cover Detail.
[Response: The Town's Standard Manhole Cover detail has been provided.](#)

Drainage Report:

1. Discuss compliance with the Town's Stream Preservation Standards in the Drainage Design Criteria of the narrative. If these standards do not apply, please directly state as such in the narrative.
[Response: Narrative regarding compliance with the Town's Stream Preservation Standards has been added into the Drainage Design Criteria section of the report.](#)
2. Verify adequate compensatory storage is provided in accordance with SDECM section 7.2.4 for the proposed basins which cannot be feasibly captured and conveyed to the existing ponds. If adequate compensatory storage is not provided, propose outlet structure modifications to accommodate the required release rate.
[Response: Compensatory storage narrative has been provided, it is not necessary since there is no change to the contributory area being received by the water quality and detention pond.](#)
3. Identify the site extents on the FIRM.
[Response: The extents of the Site has been approximated on the FIRM for reference.](#)
4. Sub-Basin OS-2 appears to be missing the basin delineation line work.
[Response: Sub-Basin OS-2 basin line delineation has been added to the basin map for reference.](#)



Environmental

GENERAL COMMENTS:

1. A portion of the surface shown as proposed grade falls outside the extents of the Limits of Construction (LOC). Please verify LOC extents.
Response: Limits of Construction have been revised per changes to Site design changes
2. Please consider other locations for the proposed Vehicle Tracking Control (VTC). While this is an ideal point of access, it falls on the downgradient side of the site providing a point of potential sediment discharge during the interim grading phase. If no other point of access is feasible through the duration of the project, provide additional control measures to ensure site flows are not discharged through the VTC.
Response: The location of the VTC has been revised and is now located at the future site entrance off of Wolf Fox Street to the west, towards the upgradient side of the site. The location is also along a street containing less public traffic.
3. Please consider directly connecting the Stabilized Staging Area (SSA) to the end of the Vehicle Tracking Control (VTC). This helps to limit traffic across disturbed areas which further limits vehicle tracking from the site.
Response: The SSA has been revised to be located adjacent to the new VTC location.
4. Provide unique identifiers for the Temporary Sediment Basins (TSB) (ie TSB1, TSB2).
Response: Unique identifiers for the Temporary Sediment Basins have been provided.
5. Provide and identify Portable Toilet Protection (PTP) for the site.
Response: Portable Toilet Protection has been added to the site
6. Provide and identify Debris and Trash Control (DTC) for all existing paved driving areas adjacent to the site and all proposed paved driving areas internal to the site.
Response: Debris and Trash Control has been provided for all existing paved driving areas adjacent to the site and all proposed paved driving areas internal to the site.
7. Omit all existing and proposed utilities from the CBMP Drawings, except those relating to stormwater.
Response: All existing and proposed utilities with the exception of those relating to stormwater have been removed from the CBMP plans.
8. Provide arrows to indicate the direction of flow.
Response: Slope arrows have been provided to indicate the direction of flow.
9. Label and identify the ratio of all slopes that are 4:1 or greater.



Response: All slope 4:1 and greater have been identified and labeled

10. Include within the plan set all of the town's 31 CBMP Notes & Details. Specifically noted IPAN and IPAP details as missing. Please also note sheets 34 and 35 appear to be out of order.

Response: All of the town's 31 CBMP notes & details have been provided within the plans. Sheet numbers have been revised accordingly.

11. Remove the Town Review Block from all CBMP detail sheets.

Response: The Town Review Block has been removed from all CBMP detail sheets.

12. Revise the Town of Parker review block to only include one signature line for "Town of Parker, Director of Engineering/Public Works" per the RDCCM. Please also note one minor typo was found in the review block where cannot is replaced with cannon. Please revise to match the Town's standard.

Response: The Town of Parker review block has been revised on all sheets accordingly.

13. Add a callout/label on all properties adjacent to the project stating that no work shall occur in these areas.

Response: A callout/label has been provided on all properties adjacent to the project stating that no work shall occur in these areas.

14. Label wetland habitat protection areas, jurisdictional status and other "Waters of the U.S."

Response: Wetland protection areas have been identified and labeled as applicable.

15. Add the following note to the initial and final CBMP plan sheets:

"LOT PROTECTION (LP) IS REQUIRED ON ALL RESIDENTIAL LOTS PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY."

Response: The above note has been included on the initial and final CBMP plans.

16. Add the following note to the initial and final CBMP plan sheets:

"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: The above note has been included on the initial and final CBMP plans.

INITIAL CBMP PLANS:

1. Include perimeter controls for the entire Limits of Construction (LOC). Perimeter control should be silt fence (SF) when downstream of disturbed areas and Construction Fence (CF) when upstream of disturbed areas.

Response: Perimeter controls for the entire Limits of Construction have been included. Silt fence has been provided on the downstream side of the disturbed areas and Construction Fence on the upstream side of disturbed areas.

INTERIM/FINAL CBMP PLANS:

1. Provide and identify sediment control logs (SCL) along all paved areas adjacent landscape/pervious areas. This includes landscape islands and all pedestrian walks.

Response: Sediment Control Logs have been provided along all paved areas adjacent to landscape/pervious areas to include landscape islands and all pedestrian walks.

2. Provide and identify Sidewalk Transition Protection (STP) for all proposed pedestrian ramps adjacent to landscaped areas.

Response: Sidewalk Transition Protection has been added to the drawings.

3. Provide and identify Erosion Control Blanket (ECB) on all slopes steeper than 4:1.

Response: Erosion control blankets have been provided at all slopes greater than 4:1.

4. Provide and identify Masonry Work Protection (MWP) for the site.

Response: Masonry Work Protection has been identified in the drawings.

5. Provide and identify Surface Roughening (SR) in all proposed landscaped areas.

Response: A note was added stating “refer to landscape plans for final stabilization in non-hardscaped areas”.

6. Remove the Rock Socks (RS) shown in the pond and replace them with one callout of Detention Pond Protection (DP).

Response: Rocks socks have been removed and a Detention Pond Protection callout has been added.

7. Provide and identify the appropriate means of inlet protection from the Town's four inlet protection types for all proposed and existing inlets. Several inlets noted missing these control measures and several of these control measures noted on the plans as missing inlets. Please note all landscape drains should receive IPAN inlet protection as well.

Response: All inlets have been provided with their corresponding inlet protection type



8. The submittal is not in general conformance with the Town of Parker's Roadway Design and Construction Criteria Manual and Storm Drainage and Environmental Criteria Manual. The submittal must be revised and re-submitted for review. All submittals should be through the Town Community Development Department, accompanied by a letter that responds to each comment herein. Direct submittals to the Engineering Department will not be accepted.

[Response: Acknowledged, the submittal will be revised and resubmitted for review.](#)

9. An attempt has been made to identify all of the items that do not meet the Town of Parker's design criteria; however, it remains the developer's responsibility to ensure that all criteria are met.

[Response: Acknowledged](#)

Link to Town Engineering Standards and Criteria:
<http://www.parkeronline.org/210/Standards-and-Criteria>

If you have any questions regarding the comments, please do not hesitate to contact the Engineering Department at (303) 840-9546

IREA:

1. DENIED – The proposed apartment buildings, monuments, retaining walls may not encroach into the existing 15-foot utility easement as shown on the CD plan set.

[Response: Site features have been shifted such that buildings, monuments, and retaining walls no not encroach within the 15-ft utility easement.](#)

Douglas County Assessors Office:

1. The legal description is listed as "Tract 2 Compark Village South 1 Amendment 1" however, based on the most recent version of the Amendment 1 plat (project SUB21-050), it appears the legal description should be Tract B.

[Response: Legal description has been updated.](#)

AZTEC Comments:

1. SHT 1: The amendment 1 plat I had review on 10-4-21 called this tract B was that changed?

[Response: Tract names revised.](#)

2. SHT 1: Circle to correct space in Surveyor's Certification statement

[Response: Space Removed.](#)

3. SHT 1: Note #3?

[Response: Revised](#)

4. SHT 1: Use replat format?

[Response: updated.](#)

5. SHT 2: Show and add labels for adjacent public streets

[Response: Labels added.](#)



6. SHT 2: Add label for adjacent recorded plat – compark village south filing 2 amendment 1?
[Response: Label added.](#)
7. SHT 2: Tract a? – see comment on sheet 1
[Response: Revised.](#)
8. SHT 2: Add happy canyon creek name for orientation purposes
[Response: Label added.](#)

We hope we have adequately addressed your comments. If you have any questions, or need further clarification concerning the resubmitted plans, please don't hesitate to give me a call at 303-353-3695.

Respectfully submitted,
MERRICK & COMPANY



Kristofer K. Wiest, PE
Project Manager

