

**PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**  
CRAIG DOSSEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

2/23/2018 EES responses in RED – Sean McIntosh, P.E.

2/20/18

EES, Inc.  
Loren Root

Dear Applicant and/or Consultant:

Subject: Academy Gateway 7-11 Site Development Plan Review 2

**The purpose of this letter is to provide you with the review agency responses to the above named development application that have been received to-date by Planning and Community Development.**

**You are encouraged to directly contact those agencies that did provide review comments if the comments require additional action by the applicant/applicant's representative. You are also encouraged to directly contact those agencies that did not provide review comments if such response is required by state statutes and the El Paso County Land Development Code.**

**EL PASO COUNTY PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**Current Planning**

The application for a convenience store and gas station is being reviewed under the standards identified in Chapter 6, General Development Standards of the El Paso County Land Development Code (2017).

1. See red lines for landscape plan, and the site development plan. Planning comments are in green ink.

**Noted. Plan redlines addressed.**

Comment 1:

Attachment: Comment\_PPR17058\_1.pdf

Drainage letter Red-lines V-2

**Noted. Plan redlines addressed.**

Comment 2:

Attachment: Comment\_PPR17058\_4.pdf

Grading and Erosion Control Plans V-2 red lines

**Noted. Plan redlines addressed.**

Comment 3:

Attachment: Comment\_PPR17058\_5.pdf

Landscape plan red lines V-2

**Noted. Plan redlines addressed.**

Comment 4:

Attachment: Comment\_PPR17058\_7.pdf

Site Development Plan sheets V-2 red lines

**Noted. Plan redlines addressed.**

Comment 5:

Attachment: Comment\_PPR17058\_8.docx

Multi-discipline review 2 comment letter

**Noted. Plan redlines addressed and comments provided herein.**

## **Engineering Division**

Planning and Community Development (PCD)-Engineering reviews plans and reports to ensure general conformance with El Paso County standards and criteria. The project engineer is responsible for compliance with all applicable criteria, including other governmental regulations. Notwithstanding anything depicted in the plans in words or graphic representation, all design and construction related to roads, storm drainage and erosion control shall conform to the standards and requirements of the most recent version of the relevant adopted El Paso County standards, including the Land Development Code (LDC), the Engineering Criteria Manual (ECM), the Drainage Criteria Manual (DCM), and the Drainage Criteria Manual Volume 2 (DCM2). Any deviations from regulations and standards must be requested, and approved by the ECM Administrator, in writing. Any modifications necessary to meet overlooked criteria after-the-fact will be entirely the developer's responsibility to rectify.

The comments include unresolved previous comments and new comments resulting from the re-submittal in **bold**. All previous comments that have been resolved have been noted or deleted. A written response to all comments is required for review of the re-submittal.

#### Site Development Plan

1. See electronic redlines. **See updated redlines.**  
**Future ped ramp by others label added to site plan. Trail width and legibility revised.**
2. **Resolved OK**

#### Transportation / Traffic Impact Memorandum

1. **Resolved OK**

#### Drainage Letter Report / Drainage Plans

1. See redlines regarding WQCV and specialized BMPs. Note: the water quality portion of the Academy Gateway detention pond will need to be maintained for all lots in the subdivision. The anticipated downstream regional pond will not provide WQCV for this site. **Partially resolved, see updated redlines.**  
**Redlines addressed and notes added to report as requested.**

#### Grading and Erosion Control Plan / SWMP

1. **Resolved OK**
2. See redlines on the GEC Plan document. **See updated redline.**  
**Only comment pertains to revised ped. Ramp. Per most recent discussion with Elizabeth Nijkamp, the current configuration and radial ramp is acceptable for this private drive. Plans to remain as designed for this comment.**
3. **Resolved OK**
4. Please verify in the letter of intent that the project will be subject to the State stormwater permit and SWMP, if that is the case. If not, a site SWMP will need to be submitted.  
**Partially resolved; specify in the SWMP that stabilized vegetation levels will be 70% of the level pre-overlot grading. Provide that value from the Academy Gateway Filing 1 SWMP.**  
**Comment addressed in report.**

#### Forms/FAE

1. Add quantities and costs for permanent seeding and mulching. This would be for the case that the development was not finished and the County had to stabilize the site.  
**Partially resolved. Please use the entire disturbed area for the quantity for this item.**  
**Quantity revised.**
2. See attached Engineering Final Submittal Checklist; the items highlighted in blue will be required prior to the preconstruction meeting.  
**Blue items below will be stamped and signed with this resubmittal.**

#### Attachments/Electronic Files

1. Site Development Plan redlines **Redlines addressed.**
2. Drainage Letter Report Redlines **Redlines addressed.**

3. Engineering Final Submittal Checklist **Redlines addressed.**

Engineering Final Submittal Checklist for Electronic Submittals	
Check Box	Item: Report/Form
<input type="checkbox"/>	Drainage Letter Report (signed)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Traffic Impact Study (signed)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Grading & Erosion Control Plan (signed)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Street Construction Plans (signed)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Deviation Request (signed)
<input type="checkbox"/>	MS4 Post Construction Form and SDI worksheet DPW POC: John Chavez
<input type="checkbox"/>	Proof of embankment/pond submittal to State Engineer
<input type="checkbox"/>	ESQCP (signed) DPW POC: John Chavez
<input type="checkbox"/>	* Financial Assurance Estimate (signed)
<input type="checkbox"/>	* Pond/BMP Maint. Agreement and Easement (signed)
<input type="checkbox"/>	* Operation & Maintenance Manual
<input type="checkbox"/>	Pre-Development Site Grading Acknowledgement and Right of Access Form (signed)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: <u>Offsite Easements, Other Permits (FEMA LOMR, USACE, Floodplain...),</u> <u>Conditions of Approval, etc. _</u>
Pre-Construction Checklist:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Work Within the ROW Permit (DPW or CDOT)
<input type="checkbox"/>	* Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP)
<input type="checkbox"/>	* Colorado Discharge Permit (COR: _____ )
<input type="checkbox"/>	* County Construction Activity Permit
<input type="checkbox"/>	* CDPHE APEN – (if over 25 ac. or 6 mos.)
<input type="checkbox"/>	* Financial Surety (Letter of Credit/Bond/Collateral/Check)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Construction Permit Fee: <i>Minor Site Development Plan</i> \$ 1,037.00 (Verify fees with Inspections Supervisor at time of scheduling)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: _____

\* - required items to obtain an ESQCP

\*\* - after recordation

Permit Fee and Collateral must be separate checks

## **NORTHERN EPC COALITION OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS, INC (NEPCO)**

Reference: Academy Gateway 7-Eleven

NEPCO is providing the collective input from its membership that includes 8,600 homeowners, 41 HOAs and 18,000 registered voters within and around the Tri-Lakes area. The purpose of NEPCO, a volunteer coalition of Homeowner Associations in northern El Paso County, is to promote a community environment in which a high quality of life can be sustained for constituent associations, their members, and families in northern El Paso County. We collectively address growth and land use issues with El Paso County Planners and the Town of Monument, as well as addressing HOA issues of common interest among the members. NEPCO achieves this by taking necessary steps to protect the property rights of the members, encouraging the beautification and planned development and maintenance of northern El Paso County.

NEPCO's general comments related to Academy Gateway 7-Eleven:

Discussions related to the Academy Gateway master development proposal have continued over the last few years with the most significant concern expressed by stakeholders related to traffic in an area already experiencing robust growth. The rare combination of two "T-intersections" in close proximity and at 90 degrees to each other compounds congestion. Adding a commercial element to the mix, with access available on only one side of the development is perplexing. The Developer's proposed solution of an internal "private" drive, however requires a deviation from existing Code related to minimum distances between intersections. The Traffic Memo is limited in scope and lacks sufficient analysis to back-up their determinations is somewhat exasperating the analysis by outside stakeholders.

NEPCO's comments related to Traffic Issues:

1. Traffic Memo: There is no available documentation that demonstrates that the developer has responded to our earlier missive on the many traffic issues in that area. After reviewing this current memo, NEPCO has the following comments:
  - a. LSC, the traffic consultant, should use the latest edition of the Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition (released in Sep 2017) vs. the 9th edition (2012) as highlighted in footnote 1 on page 4, Table 1 and the Trip Generation Handbook, 3rd Edition, written in 2014, vs. the 2nd Edition (2004) as annotated in footnote 2 on page 4, Table 1, of its memo.
    - i. Do the numbers in the new guides differ significantly based on latest information?

b. The number of internal trips anticipated for the lots on page 4, Table 1 seems improbable. The original 9% internal trips for every lot seemed incredibly high given the lack of diversity of the projected businesses within the development, but now it has ballooned to between 9-15% (1 lot-9%, 2 lots-10%, 1 lot-12%, and 3 lots-15%). The proposed mix of businesses for the site to date include a gas station/convenience store, a drive-up coffee shop and an extended stay hotel. For 1 out of every 10 trips to be shared between this limited selection of businesses seems suspect.

c. The vehicle trips generated by this 7-Eleven facility was cut 40% because the number of vehicle fueling positions was reduced by 40% (20 to 12) from the original development plan (a Kum & Go). It seems that this would only make sense if the original 20 fuel pumps were projected to be in constant use with lines forming repeatedly, which common sense would strongly suggest is not the case. Perhaps a more realistic methodology should be used if this cannot be reasonably explained.

d. There was a study done by BYU applying ITE Codes to a 7-Eleven in Salt Lake City with 12 fueling stations where they examined the actual trips during peak am and pm periods versus the numbers in the ITE Handbook. It may be worthwhile for LSC to examine the report to verify real world data (for an identical business with the same configuration) versus projected data. The report can be found at <https://www.westernite.org/datacollectionfund/2015/2015%20-%20BYU.pdf>.

e. Table 5 – Comparison of Calculated Average Trip Rate and ITE Trip Generation Rates for AM and PM Peak Hours of the study is especially interesting.

NEPCO's general comments related to Academy Gateway 7-Eleven:

1. Lighting Plan: Although it appears that International Dark-Sky Association (IDA)-compliant lighting will be used on this lot, the lighting plan does not indicate the extent of illumination beyond the footprint of the lot. Therefore, we don't know how much light leakage is occurring to the other lots, the streets, the local community, and the sky.

a. As a reminder, according to the Guidelines for Good Exterior Lighting Plans, prepared by The Dark Sky Society in 2009, light should be limited to minimize spill across the property lines (called light trespass). "Light levels at the property line should not exceed 0.1 foot-candles (fc) adjacent to business properties...."

b. There are several notations on the Site Photometric Plan that indicate lumens measurements that exceed 2.0 and some measurements on the south and west side of the business where readings are expected to exceed 10 lumens at the property boundary, more than 100 times the Dark Sky compliant levels of 0.1 fc.

c. The developer should consider different lighting fixtures to resolve this issue.

1. Visual Overlay:

a. NEPCO compliments the Developer for the effort put forth in the design of the structure to comply with the Tri-Lakes Comprehensive Plan's Visual Overlay requirements. To quote the document:

i. "In conclusion, the proposed 7-Eleven design meets the goals set forth in the I-25 Corridor visual overlay plan by maintaining the natural character of the corridor, providing for native and naturalized landscaping, screening the parking lot, building and canopy, utilizing low impact signage, and employing low level lighting while maintaining the views to the Front Range."

NEPCO's final comments:

NEPCO persists in our concerns related to traffic congestion in this development. Acknowledging that the proposed private roads/internal roadway system is a valued attempt at addressing the ingress/egress issues related to this site, the core issue persists that all traffic must flow to only one property boundary to exit the development, the east boundary. The future traffic round-about should help to address this issue if the motorists can be taught to use that access point; that is an unanswerable question at this point.

Thank you for the opportunity afforded NEPCO to engage in this process to work with the El Paso County to ensure we have planned, responsible growth.

Thomas M. Vierzba  
Vice President,  
Chairman,  
NEPCO Transportation and Land Use Committee

Larry Oliver  
NEPCO President, NEPCO

## **EL PASO COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENT**

Please accept the following comments from El Paso County Public Health regarding the project referenced above:

- **The proposed lot will be provided water and wastewater services by Donala Water and Sanitation District.**
- **There is a finding for sufficiency in terms of water quality for drinking water obtained from this Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment,**



**Water Quality Control Division, regulated community water supply (PWSID CO0121175)**

- There is sufficient treatment capacity at the Donala Water and Sanitation District wastewater treatment facility to treat the projected wastewater flow from the proposed development. Please see the 18Oct2017 commitment to serve letter from Donala Water and Sanitation District.
- Radon resistant construction building techniques/practices for this structure is encouraged to be used. The EPA has determined that Colorado, and the El Paso County area have potentially higher radon levels than other areas of the country.
- Earthmoving activity is in excess of one acre, but less than twenty-five acres (which this project falls within these size requirements), requires a Construction Activity Permit from El Paso County Public Health. Go to <https://www.elpasocountyhealth.org/service/air-quality/construction-activity-application> for more information.
- El Paso County Public Health encourages planned walk-ability of residential communities to neighboring commercial/convenience properties when feasible. Please consider appropriate connections to commercial areas through the use of sidewalks, and bike trails. Walk- ability features help reduce obesity and associated heart diseases.
- Retail Food Service Establishments are regulated and licensed by El Paso County Public Health and require interior finish plans to be reviewed and approved by El Paso County Public Health prior to construction.

Mike McCarthy, R.E.H.S.  
El Paso County Public  
Health Environmental  
Health Division  
719.575.8602  
[mikemccarthy@elpasoco.com](mailto:mikemccarthy@elpasoco.com)  
06Jan2018

**TRI-LAKES-MONUMENT FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT**

This is not our district please refer to Wescott Fire. Thanks.

---

**Due to the number of comments and necessary revisions to the plan(s) an additional detailed review will be necessary. Please address the comments as listed above. A detailed letter needs to accompany the revisions to allow for an expeditious re-review timeframe. The letter should include each comment listed above and, immediately thereafter, include a response from the applicant addressing the comment.**

**If any review agency has an issue that needs resolution or requires a revision, you will need to provide the necessary documents, drawings, etc., to the Planning and Community Development Department in the form of a resubmittal. The Planning and Community Development Department will then forward the resubmitted items directly to the appropriate review agency. If you have any questions pertaining to specific agency comments please contact the appropriate agency directly.**

When all the comments have been addressed and corrections made please upload the required documents as requested.

If you have any questions feel free to contact me at 719-520-6306.

Best Regards,  
*Kari Parsons*

El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department

cc: Jeff Rice, Engineering  
File: PPR-17-058