



Steve Hammers, President

HAMMERS CONSTRUCTION, INC

1411 Woolsey Heights. Colorado Springs, Colorado. 80915-5400

(719) 570-1599 | www.hammersconstruction.com

Specializing in Design/Build

REVISION RESPONSE LETTER

**RE: Claremont Business Park 2 Filing 1, Lot 7
Site Development Plan
File Number PPR2030**

DATE: December 3, 2020

TO: John Green
Planning & Community Development
El Paso County
2880 International Circle, Suite 110
Colorado Springs, CO 80910
O: (719) 520-6300

FROM: APPLICANT
Hammers Construction, Inc.
Lisa Peterson
Designer
1411 Woolsey Heights
Colorado Springs, CO 80915
O: (719)-570-1599
F: (719)-570-7008

Dear John,

Upon receipt and review of the comments provided to us on October 19, 2020, we offer the following response. We have incorporated comments received from the development services department into these minor revisions. Please review and call with any questions you might have.



1. *Letter of Intent must address all reports and plans included in the submittal. Revise Letter of Intent to address specific criteria and findings of each report. **We've added additional verbiage for the traffic portion of the LOI.***
2. *Show existing and proposed topography. **Existing and proposed topography is shown on the Grading & Erosion Control Plan from M&S Civil Consultants, Inc., included in the original submission of this Site Development package. Per the Planning and Development website, "A Site Plan is an accurately scaled drawing of a lot or parcel showing, at a minimum, the property address, the schedule/tax number, all existing structures, easements, rights-of-way, setbacks from the property lines to the existing structures (if any), the location of the lot in relation to abutting streets, driveway/access location(s), and dimensions of the proposed structure and of existing structures, including height." We feel to clearly show the intent of our site layout, by keeping the plans as clean as possible to maintain the required information, the grading contours should remain off and shown on the grading plan as it is part of site development package. In addition, we try to ensure accuracy, and not be held liable, by not duplicating information that may not be carried over from outside sources, i.e., civil engineering plans. Furthermore, we have been doing plans in EPC for 20 years and this comment has never come up before. As mentioned above, we would prefer to keep the grading off of the site plan to maintain consistency, accuracy and cleanliness.***
3. *Show the location of all existing and proposed utilities on the site or in the adjacent ROW to include all easements. **Please refer to our response in comment no. 2. We feel this is not needed as utilities tend to change in the field and we don't want to have an approved document to show these discrepancies. In addition, our civil engineer coordinates this design and ensures no issues with the placement of utility services per our design. Furthermore, EPC does not stamp the utility plan.***
4. *Access Aisle must be located on passenger side of parking spaces. Revise with access aisle on passenger side. Per ICC a117.1-2009, 502.4.1: "Access aisles shall adjoin an accessible route. Two parking spaces shall be permitted to share a common access aisle. Access aisles shall not overlap with the vehicular way. Parking spaces shall be permitted to have access aisles placed on either side of the car or van parking space. Van parking spaces that are angled shall have access aisles located on the passenger side of the parking space." Our parking is not angled, so our design is good as shown. No changes made from this comment.*
5. *FYI per ADA criteria, sidewalks should go around drive apron. **Sidewalks updated.***

If you have any further questions, please give me a call.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa A. Peterson
Designer/Applicant