



19 E. Willamette Avenue  
Colorado Springs, CO 80903  
(719)-477-9429  
www.jpsegr.com

April 30, 2019

El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department  
Attn: Nina Ruiz, Project Manager  
2880 International Circle  
Colorado Springs, CO 80910

**SUBJECT: Monument Academy – Site Development Plan  
Response to County Review Comments  
PPR-19-009**

Dear Nina:

In conjunction with our Site Development Plan re-submittal, this letter provides responses to the PCD Project Manager Comments posted on March 26, 2019 and the Memorandum from PCD-Engineering dated April 8, 2019. These review comments are specifically addressed as follows **(Applicant responses are annotated in bold / red / parenthesis following each County comment):**

**PCD Project Manager Comments (3/26/19)**

1. Please add the PCD file # to all plans and reports. **(Added)**
2. A separate sign permit will be required for any proposed signage. It appears as though no sign is being proposed at this time. Please confirm and I will remove this as a submittal item. **(No monument sign details have been confirmed at this time. General Note #3 on Sh. C1.1 identifies the requirement for a separate sign permit.)**
3. A separate driveway permit will be required for the new access cut. **(Noted; we understand the driveway permit for the new access drive is a part of this SDP review and approval process)**
4. Prior to beginning construction pre-construction meeting is required. At the pre-construction meeting you must provide collateral to match that of the approved financial assurance form. **(Noted; we understand that collateral will be required at the subdivision stage)**
5. Prior to receiving CO approval PCD will complete an inspection to ensure all proposed improvements have been installed (landscaping, sidewalks, parking, etc.). **(Noted; included as GN #4 on Sh. C1.1)**
6. Any alteration of the site not in conformance with the approved site development plan in the future will require review by PCD. **(Acknowledged)**

7. The site development plan cannot be approved without approval of the location approval. **(Noted)**
8. Please be aware that if the request is approved, it would not include the YMCA component. The YMCA will require a separate permit and approval. **(Noted; included as GN#5 on Sh. C1.1)**
9. In the letter of intent, the request should be reworded to be a request for an alternative landscape plan. The Director does not have the authority to grant waivers but may grant alternatives pursuant to 6.2.2 of the LDC. **(Revised LOI)**
10. The plans as submitted have planned for future development of the remainder of the parcel and have included setbacks from future planned roadways. Please be aware that this action does not create those lot lines, nor will this action result in the County accepting the roadways. **(Noted; proposed roadways will be constructed to public standards with the intention of dedication as public roads during future subdivision process)**
- Please amend the drawing to clarify that what is planned is for the future anticipated condition but not what is being requested with this action. **(Clarified)**
11. No lighting details were included (elevation with height, detail for wall mount). **(Noted)**

Additional redlines and comments will be provided upon completion of the PCD Engineering Division review.

### **PCD Engineering Comments (4/8/19)**

#### **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.

A written response to all comments and redlines is required for review of the re-submittal. Please arrange a meeting between the developer's team and County staff to review and discuss these comments and prepared revisions/responses prior to the next submittal. Additional comments may be generated on items added or revised after the original comments. **A 21-day review period will be necessary to complete the review of deviations and all complete, revised documents. (We respectfully request an expedited review of the remaining items required for GEC and SDP approval, as**

**Monument Academy desires to begin site grading work on June 1<sup>st</sup>, followed shortly by building permitting.)**

#### General

1. The Letter of Intent requests that the requirement to post financial assurances under ECM 5.2.8 be waived, with a Letter of Responsibility provided. The use of a Letter of Responsibility is not applicable to new development. The financial assurances required are for drainage, grading and erosion control measures and public road improvements. Depending on the timing of dedication/deeding of the internal roads to the County, collateral for these roads may not be necessary. **(A Letter of Responsibility was accepted by the County for similar construction of the RMCA Charter School. We understand that collateral will be required with the future subdivision process.)**
2. Note: The Site Development Plan itself is considered advisory as noted in the LOI; however the following require a full review to ensure that County regulations and requirements are met:
  - a. the proposed roads, if they are to be County-maintained in the future;
  - b. Walker Road improvements;
  - c. drainage, grading and erosion control.

If CDOT holds separate financial assurances to the Highway 83 improvements, the County will not require additional assurances for those improvements.

**(Noted)**

3. The LOI and TIS need to address questions regarding construction phasing, including the proposed relocation of Shannon road to the west; construction of the Walker Road roundabout, proposed timing of County acceptance of the proposed roads as public roads, and compliance with County review, inspections and acceptance criteria and processes. **(TIS has been revised to identify an initial Tee Intersection at Walker Road, with the possibility of a future roundabout. As stated in the LOI, the site access roads will be constructed to public standards with the intention of dedication as public roads with the future subdivision process.)**
4. Address how the necessary property acquisition and transfer to El Paso County will take place for the Walker Road roundabout and the internal site roads. Staff's assumption is that the property owners (83 Walker LLC, Staley Trust, and Thomas) will be co-applicants to vacate and replat the Shannon Road and Walker Road rights-of-way (due to the size of the affected lot). The portion of Walker Road to be deeded from the 83 Walker LLC parcel may be deeded separately if the remainder parcel is over 35 acres in size. **(Noted; Walker Road intersection has been revised to a Tee Intersection)**
5. Note: Any utility easements for water lines within future rights-of-way will need to be extinguished prior to County acceptance of the proposed roads. **(Our understanding is that public water mains owned and operated by utility districts are commonly placed within the public right of way.)**

#### Site Development Plan

1. See Site Development Plan redlines. **(Redline comments have been addressed)**

2. Provide a plan showing trail/pedestrian/bike connectivity through the site. **(Trail / pedestrian / bike connectivity has been annotated on Sh. C1.1 and C1.2, and an exhibit is enclosed in the TIS)**
3. It is not clear that ADA design requirements are met; ensure that all accessible routes meet ADA criteria. **(ADA accessible routes have been designated on Sh. C1.2 and the Grading Plans)**

#### Transportation / Traffic Impact Study

1. See TIS redlines and previous comments on PCD project U-19-002. Resolution of those comments will be completed through this Site Development Plan review. **(Updated TIS provided by LSC)**
2. Provide a complete roundabout design report. See CD redlines regarding the roundabout. It is anticipated that the roundabout size will be similar (or closer to) to the Baptist Road (west) roundabout size for the WB-67 design vehicle. **(Walker Road intersection has been revised to a Tee Intersection)**
3. Is alternative access to the AT&T/US West parcel being provided through the site? Please address. **(Existing access will be protected during the initial phase; alternative access will be provided through the adjoining property during the time of future development)**

#### Final Drainage Report / Drainage Plans

1. See MDDP/FDR redlines. **(Redline comments have been addressed)**
2. A deviation request from ECM Section I.7.1.B will be required addressing all areas not provided with WQCV, unless the plans are revised to meet the criteria. The untreated areas need to be less than 1 acre in size and less than 20% of the developed area for the deviation to be considered. **(Drainage plans have been revised to provide additional TSB's where needed for water quality)**
3. The ECB ditch lining proposed for ditches not meeting velocity/Froude number criteria is not a permanent measure. Provide a permanent lining meeting County design and maintenance requirements. **(Revised permanent ditch lining specification as requested)**
4. See redlines regarding detention pond sizing. If the ponds are being constructed to handle future flows, the analyses for phase 1 flows still need to be provided to show compliance with release rates and drain times for the lower impervious areas. Typically the outlet structure will need to be modified at each stage of development. **(Pond C14 has been designed for ultimate development of the school site, so there will be no future upgrades needed. Pond M3 has been designed for the ultimate detention volume, but the outlet structure design has been revised based on Interim Phase 1 conditions as requested.)**
5. The PDB/BMP agreement indicates that the project is a subdivision and the "Monument Academy Property Owner's Association" will maintain the permanent BMPs. If the SDP is approved prior to the subdivision and the POA entity is not existing at the time of SDP approval the agreement should include the entity responsible for maintenance in the interim and should be written for the land use, not the subdivision. Additional owner(s) need to be included for the

offsite detention basin. Revisions to the agreement will be provided when available. **(Noted; revised BMP agreements)**

#### Construction Plans / Geotechnical Issues

1. See CD redlines. **(Redline comments have been addressed)**
2. Note: Complete CDs and deviation requests must be submitted for Staff to provide a complete review of the CDs. **(Noted)**
3. On the cover sheet, provide contact information for the serving Fire Department in addition to the other contacts. **(Added Fire Dept. contact info.)**
4. Provide a soils/geotechnical study as appropriate for road and drainage construction. Reference ECM Appendix C. Provide embankment key-in and compaction and collar requirements as applicable on the CDs. **(Geotechnical report by Kumar provided with re-submittal)**
5. Provide complete detention pond details, including emergency spillway width, length and horizontal and vertical control points (as well as any other details required by the State). **(Detention pond details are provided on Sh. C3.1-C3.3)**
6. Provide a master construction phasing plan/map addressing the following:
  - a. Initial access for school construction; **(Noted on Sh. C2.0)**
  - b. Timing of right-of-way acquisition for roundabout and Shannon Road (will that property owner be a co-applicant or sell developer the property?); **(No longer applicable)**
  - c. Shannon Road (public road) realignment and construction of the roundabout on Walker Road; **(No longer applicable)**
  - d. Internal road construction phasing (address cul-de-sac on east end); **(Southeast access drive to school serves as an interim “hammerhead” turnaround for maintenance equipment)**
  - e. Timing of conveyance of the internal roads to El Paso County. **(Conveyance to County will occur during future subdivision process as noted in LOI)**
7. Provide complete construction plans including ROW/easement plans for the roundabout, Walker Road shoulders and ditches and the proposed relocation of Shannon road to the west. **(Provided)**
8. Verify that fire hydrant locations meet ECM Section 2.3.5 and Table 2-17 clear zone requirements for the road classifications. **(Verified; all hydrants are now located behind curb)**

#### Grading and Erosion Control Plan / SWMP

1. See GEC and SWMP redlines. **(Redline comments have been addressed)**
2. Ensure that all GEC Plan and SWMP checklist items (attached) are provided. GEC and SWMP checklists will be reviewed in detail with the next submittal. For any unknown/undetermined items, add a note to the GEC Plan stating how they will be addressed. **(Noted)**
3. It appears that proposed grading has not been tied in in some areas, which will result in revisions including steeper slopes or offsite grading. Ensure that proposed contours are complete. **(Proposed contours have been updated)**

4. Provide additional temporary sediment basins where appropriate. **(Added TSB's)**

Agreements / Forms / Financial Assurances Estimate / Other

1. An incorrect version of the ESQCP form was submitted; provide the correct version. **(Corrected ESQCP form)**
2. FAE:
  - a. See cursory FAE redlines. **(Redline comments addressed)**
  - b. Note: FAE minimum costs may be revised in the near future requiring update of this FAE. FAE quantities and costs will be reviewed in detail with the next submittal. **(Noted)**
  - c. Add a cost in the line for as-built plans (detention basins and Walker Road improvements). **(Added)**
3. See attached Engineering Final Submittal Checklist; the items highlighted in blue will be required prior to the preconstruction meeting. **(Noted)**

Please call if you have any questions or need any additional information.

Sincerely,  
**JPS Engineering, Inc.**

John P. Schwab, P.E.

cc: Brian Risley, CRP Architects