



April 1, 2022

WDG Baptist LLC
Att: Corie Fraker
4201 E Yale Ave, Ste 140
Denver, CO 80222
cfraker@walldevgroup.com

RE: Monument Ridge – Retail Paint Store Final PUD Plan

Dear Mr. Fraker,

Your Final PUD Plan for Monument Ridge – Retail Paint Store has been reviewed by outside agencies and Town Staff. Comments and necessary revisions have been compiled and are provided below. Some items are summarized in the interest of being concise and clear. Names and contact information are provided should you need to discuss any of the comments with the specific reviewer. Town comments are provided at the end of the letter; duplicate comments have been removed for your convenience. There may be additional comments/revisions as a result of your response to this first round of comments. We are happy to discuss any of these items, if necessary.

PROJECT NARRATIVE

Debbie Flynn, Planner II – Town of Monument

719-488-1604, dflynn@tomgov.org

1. Please provide the following criteria for review requirements:

D. Criteria for review. The final PUD must adequately address the following criteria in a manner consistent with public health, safety and welfare:

1. The final PUD conforms to or is consistent with the preliminary PUD;

2. Circulation is designed for the type of traffic generated, safety, separation from living areas, convenience, access, handicap access, noise and exhaust control. Though generally discouraged, private internal streets may be considered where appropriate to the development. A proper institutional framework, such as a metropolitan or special district must be established for maintenance thereof for the life of any private streets. All streets shall be accessible by police and fire department and other emergency vehicles for emergency purposes, and to service vehicles such as trash trucks. Bicycle and pedestrian circulation and connections shall be provided;

3. Functional parks, open space, and trails in terms of recreation, views, density relief, convenience, function, connectivity, and optimum preservation of natural features including trees, shrubs, wildlife habitat, scenic areas and riparian and drainage areas are provided in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan, the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Master Plan, and the Development Standards (Chapter 18.05 of this title);

4. A variety of development and housing types and styles, and densities are proposed. Mixed land use is encouraged;

5. Privacy for individuals, families and neighbors is provided as appropriate;

6. Building design in terms of orientation, spacing, materials, exterior color and texture, storage and lighting result in a quality architectural design that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. The placement of identical or similar residential models on any two adjoining lots along a street is discouraged;

7. The landscaping is a quality design that enhances the site and is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood as shown by amount, types, and materials used. Entrance features are encouraged. The proposed landscaping must not create maintenance problems and shall be suitable for the site and neighborhood including plant hardiness. A xeriscape design that will conserve water is required;

8. Adequate off-street parking will be provided:

a. Particularly for single-family residences in a PUD, required front-yard setbacks should be established and driveways should be arranged so as to provide off-street parking therein without causing parked autos to block sidewalks.

b. The Town may increase or decrease the normally required number of off-street parking spaces based on a consideration of the following factors:

i. The relationship of the proposed modifications to the stated purposes and intent of the PUD;

ii. Probable number of vehicles owned by residents;

iii. Parking needs in nonresidential areas;

iv. Varying time period of use, whenever joint use of common parking areas is proposed;

and

v. Availability and use of alternative transportation methods.

9. The final PUD has been shown to fit within the context of the planned land use pattern and roadway and utility systems of the larger surrounding area.

https://library.municode.com/co/monument/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT18LADECO_CH18.03ZO_ART4PLUNDE_18.03.460FIPUPL

GEOTECH REPORT

Mark Kitzmiller – Jacobs

484-269-3738, Mark.Kitzmiller@jacobs.com

1. Light Duty pavement section does not meet the Monument standard. A minimum of 6-inch thickness is required for ABC in any application.

EES Response: Within the Final PUD Plan and future CD's 4" paving thickness does not and will not appear.

DRAINAGE COMPLIANCE LETTER

Mark Kitzmiller – Jacobs

484-269-3738, Mark.Kitzmiller@jacobs.com

Report:

1. The proposal appears to meet the criteria for use of the "Drainage Letter" report format.

EES Response: Acknowledged.

2. A sheet for Engineer's and Developer's Statements should be added.

EES Response: Added.

3. Additional information is requested regarding the storm pipe stub that is described as an extension to which the proposed Type C inlet will connect (pg. 3). Does this pipe exist? If so, what size is it and how is it connected to the downstream system? If not, who will install it?

EES Response: This pipe does not exist; at the time we were attempting to coordinate the pipe being constructed with apartment site to the south. In discussions with Tom Martinez it came to light that the apartment site is already 80% vertical so constructing the pipe is no longer feasible. A new configuration for handling the offsite drainage from the church and from behind the retaining walls was approved by Tom that includes positioning a Type C inlet fitted with a water quality filter insert closer to the retaining walls and discharging to the access road flow line. I have included email correspondence with Tom Martinez with this submittal.

4. Channel design is required for the proposed diversion ditch.

EES Response: Hydraulic calcs for swale/diversion ditch behind the retaining walls has been added to the letter.

5. Figure 3.4.2-2. on pdf page 40 refers to a Type 13 “combination inlet,” whereas the existing parking lot inlet appears to be simply a Type 13 with valley grate. Actual capacity of this inlet should be confirmed.

EES Response: This is correct, the inlet is a valley grate, not a combination inlet. Capacity calcs revised.

Existing Drainage Map:

1. A temporary retention pond is shown on the lot to be developed. Historical drainage reports do not indicate a pond is required here. Please provide a statement or other indication that this pond is indeed “temporary” (i.e., that there are no adverse consequences associated with its removal).

EES Response: Call-out removed.

Proposed Drainage Map:

1. There appears to be a typo in the Basin Summary Table, C5 value for Design Point 4 is 0.89 elsewhere in the report.

EES Response: Per the rational calculations this value should be 0.89. Where 0.90 was called-out it was incorrect and is now revised.

2. An easement may be required for the off-site diversion ditch and Type C inlet, as well as the storm pipe from the Type C inlet. Operation and maintenance responsibilities need to be addressed.

EES Response: Type C inlet no longer proposed here.

3. Autozone and Monument Ridge Apartments plans indicate provisions for a 24” storm pipe stub, originating in the Lot 1 Monument Ridge Apartments tract, due south of the curb inlet on the Autozone site. This current plan indicates an 18” pipe extending from this general vicinity, and indicates the pipe is “by others.” As stated previously, it is not clear whether this pipe exists or is proposed, and if the latter, who will install and maintain it.

EES Response: Please see previous discussion.

TRAFFIC GENERATION ANALYSIS

Mark Kitzmiller – Jacobs

484-269-3738, Mark.Kitzmiller@jacobs.com

No comments.

EES Response: Acknowledged.

Gilbert LaForce, PE – El Paso County Planning @ Community Development

gilbertlaforce@elpaso.com

1. Update the traffic memo to include a comparison to the Traffic Impact Study associated with the overall Monument Ridge development. Is the proposed land use and site trip generation still in conformance to the original study's estimate.

Include a reference to the original TIS and include the trip generation estimates from the original TIS as an appendix.

EES Response: Revised traffic memo forthcoming.

2. Provide a summary on whether or not there were offsite improvements identified in the overall Monument Ridge TIS that were to be phased. If applicable, identify these offsite improvements and state whether this application trigger said improvement.

EES Response: Revised traffic memo forthcoming.

Debbie Flynn, Planner II – Town of Monument

719-488-1604, dflynn@tomgov.org

No comments.

EES Response: Acknowledged.

FINAL PUD PLAN

Mark Kitzmiller – Jacobs

484-269-3738, Mark.Kitzmiller@jacobs.com

Sheet 1:

1. The Site Data Chart should be expanded to include applicable data as required in the Final PUD checklist (e.g., min./max. dimensions, bulk standards, etc.).

EES Response: Added.

2. A symbol is missing in the Legend for Proposed Site Lighting.

EES Response: Added.

3. Call out crosswalk bars.

EES Response: Call-out added.

4. There are no proposed signs shown but there is a proposed sign symbol in the legend. Please show any proposed signing.

EES Response: Signs in legend now needed.

5. Both ADA parking stalls need to be signed. The left stall should be signed as "Van Accessible".

EES Response: Signage added.

6. Proposed asphalt drive hatch doesn't clearly define where pavement limits stop especially at southwest corner of property. Will pavement extend to Providence point?

EES Response: Additional hatch added to demonstrate more clearly extents of paving.

7. Plans do not call out two sets of lines east of the retail space. It is assumed that they are walls

based on the location of the existing walls, but this should be clarified.

EES Response: Additional annotations now provided.

Sheet 2:

1. Sheet is identified as “Preliminary” Utility Plan. Final PUD checklist requires a “Final” utility plan.

EES Response: Revised.

2. Proposed services such as gas, electric and telecom should be shown.

EES Response: Now shown.

3. Boxes north of the site should be identified (e.g., transformer, pull-box, etc.)

EES Response: Annotations added.

4. A separate tap and meter for irrigation should be shown, if provided.

EES Response: Triview Metro indicated their preference for an inside meter setting. The irrigation now pulls off interior to the building after the meter.

5. The purpose of the proposed gate valve just east of the proposed water service tap should be confirmed.

EES Response: Removed.

6. Dimension between water and sanitary sewer services should be provided.

EES Response: Added.

7. There is a potential conflict between the proposed wall and existing water line, near the south driveway access.

EES Response: The wall here is only a landscape wall, <18” over waterline.

8. Existing and proposed water and sanitary sewer line diameter, length, slopes, and inverts should be identified.

EES Response: Added.

9. Other plan sheets identify an 18” storm pipe in the adjoining Monument Ridge Apartments tract to the south. This should be added to this sheet. Is the storm pipe existing or proposed?

EES Response: It was assumed that this pipe was to be constructed by the apartments which is under construction now, but it was not, so after discussions with Tom Martinez of the Town, he agreed to allow discharge to the private road flowline after water quality treatment in a Type C inlet.

10. Missing sanitary sewer/water line crossing callouts (e.g., depth of existing water relative to tie in location of sanitary sewer).

EES Response: Service layout revised.

11. Missing Utility Details sheet.

EES Response: Added.

Sheet 3:

1. The two legends should identify the property line consistently with the plan and other sheets.

EES Response: Revised.

2. A symbol is missing in the Legend for Proposed Site Lighting.

EES Response: Revised.

3. Legend items including traffic flow, ADA route and proposed sign(s) should be added to the plan.

EES Response: Traffic flow removed from legend, ADA route and proposed signs added.

4. Detailed grading will be required on the Construction Documents. The following areas are noted on the preliminary grading plan:

- a. A 12"+ curb height is indicated along the west building sidewalk.
EES Response: Grading revised, there is no longer a 12"+ curb height..
- b. Clarity for drainage at the northwest parking lot edge, and along the southwest access drive curb line.
EES Response: Acknowledged, to be provided in CDs.
- c. ADA route details (ramps, landings, etc.).
EES Response: Acknowledged to be provided in CDs.
- d. Grading for the diversion ditch east of the retaining wall extends onto the adjoining property. An easement or other documentation of permission should be obtained.
EES Response: Revised to stay with property boundary.
- e. Off-site diversion ditch grading to the proposed Type C inlet, including graded sump.
EES Response: Acknowledged, to be provided in CDs.
- 5. Type of retaining walls should be identified.
EES Response: Acknowledged, to be provided in CDs.
- 6. The Drainage Plan identifies an 18" storm pipe in the adjoining Monument Ridge Apartments tract to the south. This should be added to this sheet. Is the storm pipe existing or proposed?
EES Response: This pipe was never constructed by the apartments.
- 7. Construction and maintenance of the off-site diversion ditch and Type C inlet will need to be coordinated with the owner of Lot 1 Monument Ridge Apartments (including the 18" storm pipe if it has not yet been installed).
EES Response: Diversion ditch and Type C inlet are now all contained within the property boundary.

Sheet L1.01:

- 1. Has the proposed parking island ground cover been coordinated with Autozone's half of the islands?
Valerian Response: Proposed parking island landscaping has been coordinated with Autozone's landscape plans.
- 2. There appear to be 2 sets of existing contours on the sheet.
Valerian Response: Redundant contours removed.
- 3. Is the proposed lighting in conflict with the proposed trees (or root systems)?
Valerian Response: Proposed light does not conflict with proposed trees and their root systems.

Sheet EP-100:

- 1. There appear to be parking light poles on the Autozone halves of the interior parking islands. Have they been considered in this lighting plan?
EES Response: These lights have been removed.
- 2. Similar comment as on the landscape plans, is the proposed lighting in conflict with the trees (or root systems)?
Valerian Response: Proposed light does not conflict with proposed trees and their root systems.

Sheet A1:

- 1. Refer to the Final PUD checklist for additional Floor Plan requirements.
Lingle Response: Acknowledged.

Debbie Flynn, Planner II – Town of Monument
719-488-1604, dflynn@tomgov.org

Site Plan:

1. The title should state Final PUD Plan rather than Preliminary Site Plan.
EES Response: Revised.
2. Please use a different color to show the project location on the vicinity map.
EES Response: Site location now shown more clearly.
3. Please provide a table stating the parking required vs provided.
EES Response: Added.
4. Please provide the signage and stripping.
EES Response: Signage added. More guidance on striping requested.
5. There are items shown in the site schedule, but not called out on the plan sheet.
EES Response: Revised.

GENERAL

Mark Kitzmiller – Jacobs
484-269-3738, Mark.Kitzmiller@jacobs.com

1. Final PUD signature blocks need to be added to the plan cover sheet.
EES Response: Added.
2. Proposed site sign locations are required, including as sign type, size, height, etc.
EES Response: Added.
4. Pavement cross-sections and curb details should be provided.
EES Response: Added.
4. Retaining wall elevations are required.
EES Response: Added.
5. An irrigation plan is required.
EES Response: Added.
6. An erosion control plan is required.
EES Response: Added to set.

Nick Harris, E.I., CWP – JDS-Hydro Consultants, Inc. (behalf of Triview Metropolitan District)
719-227-0072, Ext. 115, nharris@jdshydro.com

No comments.

Bob Swatek, Utility Construction Planner – Black Hills Energy
719-332-5856, bob.swatek@blackhillscorp.com

No comments received at this time.

John Merritt, P.E., Transportation Manager, HR Green (behalf of Triview Metropolitan District)
719-213-4893, john.adc.co@gmail.com

No comments.

Arthur Gonzales, Access Manager – Colorado Department of Transportation

719-248-0905, arthur.gonzales@state.co.us

No comments received at this time.

Corey D. Adler, District Wildlife Manger – Colorado Springs/Northwest El Paso County

719-439-9637, corey.adler@state.co.us

No comments received at this time.

Gilbert LaForce, PE – El Paso County Planning @ Community Development

gilbertlaforce@elpaso.com

PCD Engineering Division

1. The applicant will be required to obtain a Work-in-the-ROW permit from El Paso County Department of Public Works prior to constructing the proposed sidewalk connection located within Baptist Road ROW.

EES Response: Acknowledged.

2. Update the preliminary grading plan to include additional spot elevations and slope tags for the proposed sidewalk located within Baptist Road ROW. Design and construction of said sidewalk shall meet all ADA criteria and the Engineering Criteria Manual. See ECM chapter 2 and chapter 6. Label the sidewalk thickness within the ROW. Sidewalk shall be a minimum 4" thick.

EES Response: Spot elevation and slope labels added. Thickness annotation added.

3. Update the landscape plan by moving the landscape edger and the evergreen shrubs out of the ROW and inside the lot.

Valerian Response: Edger and shrubs removed from ROW.

Justin Annan, GIS Analyst – El Paso-Teller County 9-1-1 Authority

719-785-1900, jannan@elpasoteller911.org

No comments received at this time.

Kristin Salmack, Colorado Ecological Services - CDOT/USFWS Liaison

303-236-4748, kristin_salamack@fws.gov

Thank you for contacting the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). The Service has reviewed your project and has no concerns with this project resulting in impacts to species listed as candidate, proposed, threatened, or endangered.

We appreciate your efforts to ensure the conservation of threatened and endangered species. Thank you for contacting us and please let me know if you have any further questions.

Project Number: 2022-0015944

Amy Vanderbeek, Enumerations Plans Examiner – Pikes Peak Regional Building Department

719-327-2930, amy@pprbd.org

1. Address to the site is existing and can be used for this project at 705 W Baptist Road.

EES Response: Acknowledged.

2. Based on the height of the trash enclosure it does not meet the requirements to have an address or separate permit issued.

EES Response: Acknowledged.

Terri Hayes, President & CEO – Tri-Lakes Chamber of Commerce & EDC
719-481-3282, terri@trilakeschamber.com

No comments received at this time.

Chief Warren Jones - Wescott Fire District
719-488-8680, wjones@wescottfire.org

No comments received at this time.

Gina Perry, Engineering Coordinator II – Mountain View Electric Association, Inc.
719-494-2636, Gina.P@mvea.coop

This area is within the Association's certificated service area. The Association will serve this area according to our Line Extension policy. Connection requirements may include provisions for necessary line extensions and or other system improvements, and payment of all fees under the Association's Line Extension Policy. Information concerning these requirements can be obtained by contacting the Engineering Department.

The Association requests a twenty (20) foot front, side, and rear lot utility easement on the plat. The Association also requests the platting of the Association's existing facilities with easement on the plat. Additional easements may be required.

The Association will not approve the vacation of the front easement to the east property line, which is about 20'x20'. However, going south and to the east property line, we will not oppose vacating that portion of the easement. See attached drawing.

The Association has existing facilities near and within this parcel of land. If there is any damage, removal or relocation of facilities it will be at the expense of the applicant.

If additional information is required, please contact me at (719) 494-2636. Our office hours are 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Monday – Thursday.

Keith Curtis, Floodplain Administrator – Pikes Peak Regional Building Department
719-327-2898, keith@pprbd.org

Site not in the SFHA.

Elizabeth Dukes, Community Planner – Department of the Air Force 10th Civil Engineer Squadron
719-333-3085, elizabeth.dukes.3.ctr@us.af.mil

See attached letter.

Cassie Olgren, Landscape Supervisor – Town of Monument
719-884-8026, colgren@tomgov.org

No comments.

Debbie Flynn, Planner II – Town of Monument
719-488-1604, dflynn@tomgov.org

1. Please provide a cover sheet. Attached is an example, which should include the title, signature blocks, general notes, project information, Floodplain note, USAFA aircraft note, utility contacts, etc.

EES Response: Added.

2. Please include irrigation plan and detail sheets.

EES Response: Added.

3. Please include erosion control plan sheet with the grading plan sheet.
EES Response: Added.
4. Please provide grading detail sheet.
EES Response: Added.
5. Please provide a civil detail sheet.
EES Response: Added.
6. Proposed retaining wall is called out on the landscape plan sheet but not on the Site Plan. If proposing a retaining wall, please provide a detail as well.
EES Response: Added.
7. Please provide parking sign details.
EES Response: Added.

Please respond by making the above changes/revision/additions or commenting as to why the changes are not addressed. When issues are resolved to the Town's satisfaction, please submit copies of the revised plan sets with a detailed list which itemizes all revisions. Revised plan sets should be submitted in electronic format with one full size paper set provided to the Planning Department. All comments must be adequately addressed before the project will be scheduled for public hearing.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or would like to set up a meeting to discuss the comments further. I look forward to working with you on this project.

Sincerely,

Debbie Flynn
Planner II