



October 17, 2024

**RE: *McDonald's – Village at Lorson Ranch Filing No. 1 Lot 2***

To whom it concerns,

Thank you for the comments on September 23, 2024 for the above-mentioned project. To address your comments concisely and simplify your review of the utility plans, we have summarized your comments and our responses below.

## **COMMENT RESPONSE LETTER**

### **911 Authority Comments**

1. The private dr indicated on the submitted Site Development Plan is a named roadway (Center Village Hts). This name needs to be depicted on the drawings for the final submitted plat.
  - ***Response: Understood, the roadway name has been updated on all plans where it is labeled.***

### **CO Geological Survey Comments**

Submitted 9/23/2024 by Amy Crandall, Engineering Geologist, Colorado Geological Survey (303-384-2632 or [acrandall@mines.edu](mailto:acrandall@mines.edu))

2. This Site Development Plan includes the development of Lot 2 of the Village at Lorson Ranch Filing 1 development to include a McDonald's building. With this referral, CGS received a Site Development Plan (Kimley Horn and Associates, Inc., July 30, 2024); Construction Documents (Kimley Horn, July 30, 2024); Final Drainage Study (Kimley Horn, July 30, 2024); Letter of Intent (Kimley Horn, Undated); and Geotechnical Engineering Report (Universal Engineering Sciences (UES), August 18, 2023).
  - a. The site is outside the mapped floodplain of Jimmy Camp Creek and is not exposed to any geologic hazards that preclude the proposed development. CGS agrees with UES (page 4) that The upper 4 to 5 feet of the encountered soils were very soft and were not considered suitable for direct support of typical shallow foundations in their present condition, and with their recommendation, This soil would need to be removed and replaced with properly placed and compacted structural fill or be subjected to some ground stabilization or modification. Provided that UES's recommendations are adhered to, CGS has no objection to the approval of the Site Development Plan.
    - ***Response: Understood, thank you for your review.***

### **County Attorney**

Reviewed by: Erika Keech, Senior County Attorney, [erikakeech2@elpasoco.com](mailto:erikakeech2@elpasoco.com), 719-520-7013.

3. No comments from County Attorney for Development Review at this time.

- **Response:** *Understood, thank you.*

## EPC Conservation Dept

4. If the ground is disturbed, it should be mulched or revegetated within 45 days of disturbance.

- The use of Native grasses are important. Recommendations below:
  - Shotgun Native Grass Seed Mix
  - El Paso Low Grow Seed Mix

- **Response:** *These requirements are described in the SWMP report for the contractor to adhere to. These recommendations have been shared with the landscape design team. Thank you for providing.*

5. Integrated Noxious Weed Management

- A Noxious weed control plan should be in place. We recommend a weed program be reviewed and approved by the NRCS, Colorado Department of Agriculture, Colorado State University Extension - El Paso County, El Paso County Environmental Services Department, or a qualified weed management professional prior to the land use authority approval.

- **Response:** *A statement has been added in the "Initial Phase" Section of the SWMP Report for the contractor to implement a Noxious Weed Control Plan.*

## EPC Parks and Community Services

6. The 2022 El Paso County Parks Master Plan shows this project impacting the proposed Crews Gulch Primary Regional Trail, which runs west-east along the north side of Fontaine Boulevard, commencing far to the southeast at its intersection with the Fountain Creek Regional Trail and terminating at its intersection with the Jimmy Camp Creek Regional Trail in the nearby Lorson Ranch development. A review of aerial photography, as well as a site inspection, and review of the Construction Documents and Landscape Plans showed a 6'-wide detached and meandering concrete sidewalk along the north side of Fontaine Boulevard at this location. This sidewalk will suffice for the location of the Crews Gulch Regional Trail and therefore, no trail easement is necessary for this section of trail which already allows for public multi-modal pedestrian access. As this is a commercial application, no regional park fees will be assessed, however an update to the EPC Land Development Code over the next year and half may or may not change this fee requirement.

- **Response:** *Understood, thank you.*

## EPC Stormwater

Reviewed by: Glenn Reese P.E. Stormwater Engineer III, 719.675.2654,  
[GlennReese@elpasoco.com](mailto:GlennReese@elpasoco.com)

7. The O&M Manual and PBMP Applicability Form are two different things. The PBMP Applicability Form (linked below) is required even if a PBMP is not required, just to show what exclusions apply and/or the reason a PBMP is not needed.

- **Response:** *Form has been provided with this submittal.*

8. See below markups for comments
  - a. GEC Checklist
    - i. Add PPR2427 to Checklist
      - **Response:** *Application number was added.*
    - ii. Make sure that you have a note somewhere in the GEC Plans that addresses the existing condition of the Veg. I didn't see one while skimming the notes. But there are a ton of notes and I couldn't CTRL+F the plans.
      - **Response:** *Ref. note #15 on the Initial Plans*
    - iii. Update item "t" to N/A
      - **Response:** *Updated.*
    - iv. Ref. comments on SWMP report for item "x"
      - **Response:** *See response to SWMP comments.*
    - v. Checklist item "z" not fully completed
      - **Response:** *See response to SWMP comments.*
  - b. SWMP
    - i. Add PPR2427 to Cover
      - **Response:** *Application number was added.*
    - ii. [For the SB section], revise to be site specific. Since the site has >1ac of disturbance, technically (GEC Checklist Item "x") one sediment basin or at least 2 sediment traps are necessary. Otherwise explain that the downstream existing EDBs G1 & G2 will act as TSBs during construction, especially since several inlets from the site to the ponds are existing.
      - **Response:** *SB's were added to the GEC plans. Calcs and details were also added.*
    - iii. In the final stabilization section, revise the "Trickle channel" for "EDB" notes to be site specific
      - **Response:** *revised.*
    - iv. Revise to be site specific.
  - c. ESQCP
    - i. Add PPR2427 to application and use the latest form
      - **Response:** *Application number was added and form was updated*

## Mountain View Electric

Gina Perry, R.O.W. Specialist, (719) 494-2636, Gina.P@mvea.coop

9. This area is within Mountain View Electric Association, Inc. certificated area. MVEA currently serves this parcel according to our Line Extension Policy. Information

concerning connection requirements, fees, and upgrades under MVEA's Line Extension Policy can be obtained by contacting MVEA's Engineering Department.

■ **Response:** *Understood, thank you.*

10. MVEA requests twenty (20) foot front, side, and rear utility easements on commercial lots and will work with the developer on the design of the electric service and to acquire any additional easements. MVEA also requests the platting of MVEA's existing facilities with easements on the plat. Additional easements may apply.

■ **Response:** *The Plat is being run by the Master Development. Per the Master Development plat, there is a 20-ft easement split between the adjacent lots (10-ft on our lot, and 10-ft on the abutting lot) on the East and West sides of the lot. We believe this easement was coordinated between MVEA and the Master Development. However, we have submitted for the application for this site with MVEA and are awaiting a designer to be assigned. Once they are assigned, we will coordinate with them to propose any necessary easements. We will provide any additional easements through a separate easement agreement/exhibit as the Plat is not being run by us but rather the Master Development.*

11. MVEA 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.

■ **Response:** *Understood, thank you.*

## PCD Proj Manager

12. Please see planning comments to the following documents:

a. Site Development Plan

■ **Response:** *Please see markups for comment responses*

b. Sign Plan

i. Please provide:

1. Summary of square footage of the total allowed signage and existing and proposed signage for the property.
2. Setback distances from all lot line to all existing and proposed signs.
3. Detailed description of illuminating devices and how the proposed illumination will be in compliance with the lighting standards.

■ **Response:** *Provided.*

## PPRBD

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

O: 719-327-2930 E: [Amy@pprbd.org](mailto:Amy@pprbd.org)

13. Contact Enumerations for the layout prior to plan submittal with RBD.

- **Response:** *The addresses were coordinated with PPRBD Enumerations via the permit team (Rogue Entitlements). McDonalds was assigned 9664 Fontaine Blvd, and the trash enclosure/storage shed was assigned 9670 Fontaine Blvd.*

14. In the title block of the first page of the developments plan the title block & below legal description of the parcel should read; The northeast quarter of the NORTHEAST quarter, not northwest.

- **Response:** *The address previously provided on the coversheet was incorrect. Please reference the parcel number instead to get info from County Assessor. Based on the Plat draft from the Master Developer/ALTA survey, the legal description will be “the S ½ of the SE ¼ of Section 15...”.*

15. On the El Paso County Assessor’s website there are still 3 buildings listed that you are not showing on site. Add these to the site plan or contact the Assessor’s get these structures removed (STORAGE WAREHOUSE, UTILITY BLDG & EQUIPMENT BLDG). Clarify which will be done.

- **Response:** *The address previously provided on the coversheet was incorrect. McDonalds was assigned 9664 Fontaine Blvd, and the trash enclosure/storage shed was assigned 9670 Fontaine Blvd. Since the Address will not be in the County Assessor yet, please reference the parcel number instead to get information from County Assessor. By searching the parcel number, it shows that there are no existing buildings onsite.*

16. How tall is the 2 proposed gates and fencing? If the fencing and gates exceeds 7, a separate address will need to be assigned along with a separate permit. Please clarify.

- **Response:** *The trash enclosure, which includes gates/screen walls, is to be max 6-ft tall. The storage facility attached to the trash enclosure is to be 9’-6” tall. The address for the storage facility has been coordinated with PPRBD Enumerations via the permit team (Rogue Entitlements) and was assigned 9670 Fontaine Blvd.*

### Widefield School District

David Gish, Chief Operations Officer, Widefield School District #3, [gishd@wsd3.org](mailto:gishd@wsd3.org)

17. Per letter provided, no comments or objections to the SDP from the .

- **Response:** *Thank you for your review.*

### Widefield W&S District Comment

18. Callout Backflow Preventer.

- **Response:** *Backflow preventer has been called out as requested.*

### EPC Engineering

Ethan Jacobs [ethanjacobs@elpasoco.com](mailto:ethanjacobs@elpasoco.com) 719.520.6876

Charlene Durham [CharleneDurham@elpasoco.com](mailto:CharleneDurham@elpasoco.com) 719.520.7951

19. We have comments on the following submittal documents:

- a. Drainage Report
- b. Financial Assurance Estimate
- c. Utility Plan
- d. Grading Erosion Control Plan

Please reach out if you need any clarification.

- **Response:** *Please see markups for comment responses*

Thank you for your review. Please contact me at (719) 453-0180 or [jessica.mccallum@kimley-horn.com](mailto:jessica.mccallum@kimley-horn.com) should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.



Jessica McCallum, P.E.  
Project Manager