



▷ 7222 Commerce Center Dr. | Suite 220 | Colorado Springs, CO 80919  
Main 720.602.4999 + Fax 844.273.1057

▷ [HRGREEN.COM](http://HRGREEN.COM)

January 17, 2022

Kari Parsons

Engineering Department  
City of Fountain  
City Administration Building  
116 South Main Street  
Fountain, CO 80817

Re: Agency Review Comments

Dear Ms. Parsons,

We are in receipt of your review letter dated October 21, 2021. Below is a point-by-point response to the unresolved comments prepared in coordination with the (Developer) and Design Team.

1. Geology Soils Report Comments – Please see Section 8.4.9 of the Code and ECM Appendix C.2.2.E for report requirements; the applicant is requesting approval of utilities installation now.

**HR Green Response: The subsurface Soil Investigation has been modified to comply with the Geological Hazzard Report requirements. The SOIL, GEOLOGY, and Geological Hazard, The Cottages at Mesa Ridge (dated December 22, 2021 is included with this resubmittal. Please note, developer is not requesting approval of utility installation now.**

2. Please see checklist for PUD and prelim and add missing info. Emailed to you.

**HR Green Response: The updated checklists have been completed and are attached with this submittal.**

3. Please contact any review agency directly to address their comments or timing of their comments.

**HR Green Response: Noted.**

4. Staff is consulting with CDOT regarding the noise study. Planning staff was surprised that a noise wall or setback is not needed along Powers, as they have been needed along Constitution, and Marksheffel Road for multiple projects. The comparison or statement describing the analysis of the outcome of the study to the Federal guidelines regarding the decibel allowable for residential development adj to a highway was not done. Post CDOT comments, provide a letter making that comparison. I believe the Federal regulations are differ from the land development code. Comments will be posted after CDOT environmental reviews. Staff spoke with Vallerie Vigill today regarding their comments and they should be forthcoming. If it is deemed that additional construction practices, setbacks, or sound wall are required please provide notes and detail on PUDSP plan.

**LSC Response: The CDOT comment letter didn't contain any environmental comments and there are no additional comments from CDOT posted on EDARP.**

5. A comment review meeting is required to go over redlines and processing. Please contact staffer for a meeting time.

**HR Green Response: Addressed, meeting held virtually on 12/16/21.**

6. Provide the details for the residential club house w/ pool on a sheet; this is in-lieu of a site development plan. Verify all dimensions and SF is depicted on detail and any parking, ADA ramps sidewalks, patio areas etc

**HR Green Response: Additional detail has been provided for the residential club house within the final landscaping plans and Preliminary/PUD Plan. Please note there is no pool proposed.**

7. Based on the actual submittal documents, the process will be simplified. The applicant will process a PUDSP (combined PUD prelim plan) and water sufficiency will be obtained at this stage. The PUDSP goes to PC and BOCC. One administrative final plat will be approved-no hearings. Then no site development plan will be needed. The applicant will submit individual residential site plans with the BESQCP and driveway permit, when pulling each 2-family dwelling building permit through regional building just like a typical single family residential development would. This will save 3 months likely, if not more.

**HR Green Response: Acknowledged.**

8. FMIC approval letter from Board meeting for access shall be provided.

**HR Green Response: Attached to this submittal is the additional correspondence we have had with the FMIC. The following has been extracted from their email:**

*“The conditional approval by the FMIC Board has been granted a few months ago. This conditional approval required the submittal of the FMIC application form (already submitted); FMIC application fee (of which \$2,500 has been submitted, need to submit the remaining \$1,500); submit design plans for the installation of the concrete pipe within the existing FMIC right-of-way (to be submitted and approved by this office); assurance that the emergency access roadway located within the FMIC right-of-way will be permanently maintained by either the applicant or a future Metro District for this project; and coordinate all construction work with FMIC personnel during the summer months to not interfere with operation of the ditch at this time.*

*FMIC has no additional comments with respect to this project at this time and will allow the canal to be filled in once final design plans have been approved.*

**Based on the above, we will be preparing and submitting Construction Drawings for the work within the FMIC right-of-way. We will not be able to receive official Board approval until these Plans have been reviewed and approved. Based on their comments which indicate that they have no objections to the work as currently proposed, we are requesting that FMIC Board approval be a condition of approval that be provided to the County at time of Final Plat.**

9. The fire protection district information provided an email stating they will approve a variance for the secondary emergency access location. There was not an official commitment letter stating they commit to serve the development and were ok with the “driveway” (2-family dwelling, not singly-family attached) serving the 122 units nor the irregular hammer head end road at the northern point of the development. Add the private road (drive) names to the plans so fire can call them out in their letter.

**HR Green Response: The Fire Department provided a commitment letter dated 08/14/2021 (additional copy provided with this submittal). We have reached out to them multiple times with a request that they modify this letter per your request above. We will continue to make the requested and provide the updated letter as soon as we receive it.**

10. Water sufficiency is pending the State and CAO.

**HR Green Response: Acknowledged.**

### **Pikes Peak Regional Building Department**

1. Each modular duplex will receive a single address with two unit numbers. Please, when submitting plans, show proper unit numbering, not Unit A/Unit B.

**HR Green Response: Unit numbers added to plan.**

2. Add unit numbers to the homes on the site plan, unit numbering is 101&102 and 101&201. Please check all unit numbers and make sure they are increasing going east and going south.  
**HR Green Response: Unit numbers added to plan.**
3. It appears at least three street names are needed, provide a list of proposed street names to Justin Annan [jannan@elpasoteller911.org](mailto:jannan@elpasoteller911.org), and Glen West [gwest@elpasotellerp11.org](mailto:gwest@elpasotellerp11.org) with El Paso/Teller County 911 Authority. An email from E-911 showing street names is required for Enumeration approval. Once street names are approved, add to the development plan.  
**HR Green Response: Approved street names have been added to the Plans**
4. An amenity center was referenced in the letter of intent. Is this a structure? If this is a building, show location on approved development plan for addressing.  
**HR Green Response: Yes this building is a structure, Location shown on plan. Addressing location (xxx) added.**
5. Southwest is misspelled in the legal title block on the PUD plans.  
**HR Green Response: Typo corrected.**
6. When providing a site plan for addressing, please be sure to include all structures needing an address (i.e. carports, garages, trash enclosures over 7' etc)  
**HR Green Response: Addressing locations (xxx) added to plan. All structures included. Trash enclosures are less than 7' tall.**
7. Garages will require separate addresses and permits  
**HR Green Response: Noted.**
8. Trash enclosure over 7' in height will require a separate addresses and permits.  
**HR Green Response: Noted, trash enclosures are under 7' and will not require permit and address.**
9. Correct adj prop owners please. Several are missing. An email was sent to you.  
**HR Green Response: Adjacent property owners updated on plan. Missing property owner notifications have been sent out (see certified receipts dated 10 -04-21 (included with this resubmittal)).**

**Standard Development Plan Comments:**

1. For assignment of addressing for lots and tracts, place addressing marker (xxx) where they are intended to be utilized. Addressing marker for lots should be front door.  
**HR Green Response: Addressing markers (xxx) added to plan for units and garages.**
2. Provide a 100-scale copy or larger so that addressing can be assigned. Once received, the development plan will be placed on a list to be addressed. Development plans that are not yet approved may be addressed, however additional plan review fees will accrue if changes are made to the D.P. after initial addressing.  
**HR Green Response: 100-scale development plan will be provided once site plan changes are finalized.**

### **Colorado Geological Survey:**

1. Per Appendix C of the EL Paso County Engineering Criteria Manual and Section 8.4.0 of the El Paso County Land development code, a geologic hazard study should also be performed. The submitted subsurface soil investigation does not discuss the site geology nor directly discusses the potential geologic hazards associated with the site. Even so, the site does not contain steep slopes or flood hazards, nor is it exposed to any geologic hazards that preclude development. Entech's geotechnical recommendations appear appropriate to address the potential geologic constraints identified at this site, including expansive soils. If a geologic hazard report was performed earlier in the review process, we would appreciate a copy for our records.

**HR Green Response: Geologic hazard study has been completed by Entech and is included with this resubmittal**

2. Entech has identified man-placed fill and expansive clay and claystone materials that impose geotechnical constraints on the site. Entech recommends on page 7, "Due to expansive clays and claystone, overexcavation of the soils is required if shallow foundations are used. A 4-foot overexcavation is recommended for the structures... The overexcavation depth is from the bottom of footings." Also, as noted on page 11, "Compacted, non-expansive granular soil...is recommended for structural fill beneath foundation components and floor slabs." Entech's recommendations regarding subgrade preparation, overexcavation of expansive clay and claystone materials with non-expansive, granular structural fill beneath foundations and floor slabs, grading and surface drainage, and construction observations are valid. CGS agrees with Entech (page 6) that the soils (potentially man-placed fills) in the areas with deeper bedrock should be further evaluated with test pits. Provided Entech's recommendations are strictly adhered to, CGS has no objection to the PUD/preliminary plan approval.

**HR Green Response: Noted.**

3. CGS recommends Entech be retained to review the project plans and specifications for conformance with the recommendation provided in their subsurface soil investigation.

**HR Green Response: Noted.**

### **Mountain View Electric Association, Inc.**

1. The project is not in MVEA's territory.

**HR Green Response: Noted.**

### **911 Authority – EL Paso/Teller County**

1. Roads depicted in the drawings are currently lacking names

**HR Green Response: Approved private drive names have been added to plans.**

2. No road names have been requested at this time.

**HR Green Response: Approved private drive names have been added to plans.**

3. No action for E911 until road names have been requested

**HR Green Response: Approved private drive names have been added to plans.**

**County Attorney – Water**

1. County attorney's office will review for water sufficiency following receipt of findings from Colorado Division of Water Resources.

**HR Green Response: Acknowledged.**

**Fountain Mutual Irrigation Company**

1. FMIC has reviewed the proposed Preliminary Plan/PUD for the Cottages at Mesa Ridge and in particular the request to utilize the existing FMIC canal right-of-way (ROW) as an emergency secondary access for fire protection for this project. This request was presented to the FMIC Board at their August Board meeting and received conditional approval pending the following conditions. First, the proposed emergency access roadway located within the FMIC ROW must be maintained on a permanent basis by either the applicant or a metro district to be formed with this project. Secondly, the applicant must submit design plans for the proposed enclosure of the canal to FMIC for their review (including submittal of the application fee which is in process). Thirdly, all construction work within the FMIC canal must be coordinated with FMIC personnel to not impact water flows within the canal throughout the summer months. The FMIC Board will review this project and make final comments when the first submittal is made by the applicant. FMIC takes no further exception to the proposed Preliminary Plan/PUD at this time.

**HR Green Response: Noted. The Construction Drawings for the enclosure of the Canal are currently being prepared and will be submitted directly to the FMIC for review and approval. Agreements and easements for maintenance of the access road and other proposed drainage items are currently being prepared and will be submitted to the FMIC for review along with the Construction Drawings.**

Sincerely,

**HR GREEN, INC**



**Kenneth M. Huhn, P.E.**  
Senior Project Manager