



1800 38th St. • Boulder, CO 80301 • 303.442.4338 • 303.442.4373 fax
3 South 7th St. • Colorado Springs, CO 80905 • 719-260-0887 • 719-260-8352 fax
6513 W. 4th Street • Greeley, CO 80634 • 970-351-0645

January 20, 2021

El Paso County Planning and Community Development

Attn: Kari Parsons, Project Manager/Planner II
2880 International Circle
Colorado Springs, CO 80910

Re: Windermere Preliminary Plan (SP-19-003)

Ms. Parsons,

Please accept this response letter to comments received December 9, 2020

Responses to comments are in ***Bold Italics*** and follow each review comment.

General / Letter of Intent – ***Resolved.***

Preliminary Plan

1. Ensure that all Preliminary Plan checklist items are provided (reference Planning comments and redlines). ***Partially resolved (see redlines);***
 - a. Label all existing and proposed drainage facilities. ***Partially resolved.***
 - b. ***Resolved.***
 - c. Label approximate centerline grades. ***Partially resolved; please label all segments. It appears that design issues with accessible pedestrian crossings at some intersections may arise; ensure that accessible route slopes and cross-slopes will meet criteria with final design if the site is to be overlot graded. Additional slope grades added to the Prelim Plan to ensure that pedestrian access will be within criteria. Further details will be provided in the construction documents.***
2. Resolved.
3. See Preliminary Plan redlines for additional comments. ***Partially resolved; see remaining redlines. Marksheffel Road right-of-way dedication remains an issue. Marksheffel right-of-way dedication updated, ref. prelim plan.***

Transportation / Traffic Impact Study (TIS)

1. ***through 4 – Resolved.***
5. Note: If not included in the Countywide Fee program intersections, the intersection of Antelope Ridge and North Carefree will require an escrow contribution with each final plat; verify eligibility with the first final plat submittal.
6. ***Note: A detailed analysis and narrative addressing pedestrian and school issues (specifically the nearby Rocky Mountain Classical Academy) will be required and can be provided in a separate memo either with this project or the first final plat. Traffic counts during school peak hours may be required. Acknowledged – to be reviewed at final plat stage.***

Note: These comments remain cursory due to major issues that have still not been resolved.

1. See PDR Amendment redlines. Partially resolved; see updated redlines. **Partially resolved; see updated/remaining redlines. PDR revised per comments. See markup responses.**
2. Provide discussion of maintenance access and aspects of the preliminary design. Show access roads for ponds and channels on the drainage plans. Reference ECM 3.3.3.K. Partially resolved; see redlines. **Partially resolved; design and maintenance access for the detention pond and channel flowing southeast toward the northeast corner of the site need to be refined if predevelopment grading is to occur. Grading has been refined in areas noted. Detention pond maintenance access is shown.**
3. Describe what drainage improvements are proposed with the early grading, such as detention basin construction, etc. Address interim and final pond outlet construction. Will the existing north pond's embankment remain until final grading? **Unresolved; After conversation with staff, the ponds will be built to full volume during overlot grading. The outlet structures will be installed with a removable orifice plate for the interim condition to ensure WQCV release remains within criteria. For final grading, the outlet plate will be replaced. See PDR for further discussion.**
 - a. Additional design details including complete FSD forebays, outlet structures and spillway design, geotechnical recommendations, access roads, and channel design are required **if pond construction is to occur with predevelopment grading. See comment response above. Pond outlet structure plans have been provided with this resubmittal.**
 - b. Complete design details and grading and erosion control are required for the improvements at the southeast corner. It is unlikely that the existing area inlet will be allowed to be moved out of the existing County easement, or grading (fill) within the easement allowed. **Response is that a variance for grading in the easement will be applied for. This would require re-writing the easement and may not be possible. Grading has been adjusted so that there is no disturbance within the County easement.**
 - c. See redlines regarding grading in the County easement near the northeast corner of the property (same issue as 3.b, above). **Unresolved; staff do not support a deviation for filling in this drainageway easement. As with comment 3.b. above – grading adjusted for no disturbance within the County easement.**
4. A deviation request from ECM Section I.7.1.B appears to be required addressing all urban lot and road areas not provided with WQCV. Provide if applicable. **Unresolved; with the new criteria a deviation request is not possible unless the design meets the MS4 permit requirements. Provide a plan showing the areas proposed to drain offsite meeting MS4 permit requirements by email prior to the next submittal. Revise FSD pond design to include the contributing areas or provide additional BMPs if applicable. Unresolved. Basins (C1, C2 and C3) that drain offsite have been reviewed with Staff. The developed area of Basin C1 (outside the County ROW) is under an acre and drains to the east through the existing Marksheffel culvert. The combined developed area**

of Basins C2 and C3 (outside the County ROW) is under an acre and drains to the south through the Marksheffel storm system.

Grading and Erosion Control Plan / SWMP / Geotechnical

1. Resolved.
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. Partially resolved; see Stormwater redlines. **See updated/remaining redlines. GESC plan updated per comments. SWMP & GESC checklists reviewed and signed.**
 - a. **Resolved.**
 - b. Provide the new PBMP Applicability Form... **Partially resolved; see redlines. PBMP form updated.**
 - c. **Resolved.**
3. Show and label maintenance access roads on the plans. Partially resolved; see redlines on north side of the project. **(channel redlines remain) Grading along the northern boundary at the northwestern corner has been updated to provide for an onsite swale, and riprap rundown into the north pond.**
4. See cursory GEC Plan redlines. (See PCD and Stormwater redlines.) **See updated/remaining redlines (the grading will require revisions based on PDR revisions). GEC plan updated per comments.**
5. Address geotechnical requirements for embankment construction if proposed with the early grading. See soils/geotech report redlines. Unresolved. **Partially resolved; see redlines. Soils report has been updated to include recommendations for pond embankment construction. These recommendations have been updated in the PDR.**
6. Verify compliance with the new ECM Chapter 6; a link is provided below for reference. Detailed pedestrian ramp / curb return and pedestrian crossing elevation plans should be provided with the future construction plans to ensure there will not be compliance issues at the time of construction, particularly at crosswalks at stop conditions. **See Preliminary Plan comment #1c, above. Additional slope grades added to the Prelim Plan to ensure that pedestrian access will be within criteria. Further details will be provided in the construction documents.**

Forms / Financial Assurance Estimate Form

1. Note: FAE quantities and costs will be reviewed in detail with the **next submittal. Ensure that revisions are made to include all pre-development site grading items. FAE updated accordingly.**
2. See attached final submittal checklist for reference.

EDARP Comments

Colorado Springs Public Works

1. (11-25-20) *The response letter did not address previous city traffic comment. “The developer is required to remit to the city of Colorado Springs the amount of \$75,000 for the future anticipated traffic signal at the intersection of Marksheffel Road and North Carefree Circle”* **General statement added to LOI stating that the developer will comply with the City’s requirements at final plat stage.**

PPRBD

1. (12-1-20) *Marksheffel Road should be labeled as North Marksheffel Road.* **Marksheffel renamed on all plan sheets to N. Marksheffel Rd.**
2. *For assignment of addressing for lots and tracts, place an addressing marker (xxx) where they are intended to be utilized. Lot marker placement to be front door.* **Acknowledged.**
3. *Provide a 100 scale copy or larger of the entire APPROVED development to this department so that addressing can be assigned. Once received, the DP will be placed on a list to be addressed.* **Acknowledged – to be provided to PPRBD once approved.**

Colorado Geological Survey

1. (12-1-20) **RMG has provided a response letter to the CGS comments (included with this submittal)**

PCD Project Manager

1. (12-8-20) *Application is not signed by the owner of the parcel that the pond is proposed to be on. Add a second signature sheet. (Is Yes Properties retaining the land or are they deeding it to Windermere after the pond is developed)?* **YES owner has signed the application form, an additional cover sheet has been provided with their contact info. YES properties is retaining the land.**
2. *There was a reference to a District being formed to construct the public improvements within the application. Is that the case? When is that application to be submitted?* **Yes, the Windermere Metro District will be created. The application is to be submitted shortly.**
3. *Roadway landscape requirements are required (Carefree & Marksheffel). Please see Section 6.2.2, Table 6-1; Buffer requirements apply as discussed in Section 6.2.2.D.2. Please provide the landscape exhibit; this may include all buffer (screening as required in Section 8.4.2.A.1 also applies) or noise walls etc. Perhaps a tapered wall from 8-feet to 6-feet along Marksheffel is appropriate to meet screening requirements. If the noise*

study is determined to show db greater than 67 (currently greater than 66.4 db in places and greater than 65 db in majority) at plat the wall could be increased. **Landscape wall now shown along rear of lots that abut Marksheffel. Noise study will be updated at Final Plat and wall added along Carefree if deemed necessary at that time.**

4. (12-10-20) The water resource report submitted w/this review lost 17 pages verses the initial report. Please reassemble the report with current data from the two reports. **The water resource report submitted in September included a report from Cherokee Metro District specifically for the Windermere subdivision. This is the most current information.**
5. Soils and Geology redlines – please make sure to address the CGS comments in addition to staff comments. Notes will be carried over to the face of the preliminary plan. **Acknowledged. See RMG Comments. Notes on preliminary plan updated accordingly.**
6. Please note: The ECM identifies a noise wall requirement to meet Federal standards. The Federal standard is now 66db per February 2020-(Source CDOT). **Acknowledged. A 6-ft extension of the screen wall has been added to the plan along Marksheffel and Carefree. Noise study to be updated at final plat.**

We trust you find our responses to this review of the Windermere Preliminary Plan Amendment acceptable. We look forward to working with the County in processing the submittal. Please call if you have any questions or require any additional information.

Respectfully,

Drexel, Barrell & Co.



Tim D. McConnell, P.E.