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Dear Applicant and/or Consultant:

Subject: Falcon Marketplace Preliminary Plan (SP-17-001) Review 1

**The purpose of this letter is to provide you with the review agency responses to the above named development application that have been received to-date by Planning and Community Development.**

**You are encouraged to directly contact those agencies that did provide review comments if the comments require additional action by the applicant/applicant’s representative. You are also encouraged to directly contact those agencies that did not provide review comments if such response is required by state statutes and the El Paso County Land Development Code.**

**EL PASO COUNTY PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**Planning**

The preliminary plan is being reviewed within the criteria listed in the address the review and approval criteria in Section 7.2.1.D, and Chapter Nos. 7 & 8 of the Land Development Code (2016) and the procedures manual.

**New comments may be provided after the re-submittal based on the revisions to various submittal documents.**

Land Development Code

1. There is one schedule number identified on the application; however the legal identifies two parcels. Please correct.
2. The Condition of Approval relative to the preliminary plan design placed on the Commercial Regional Zoning District (CR-07-01) approval relative to Eastonville Road is as follows:
* A public roadway shall be constructed through the subject property

to allow access to Meridian Road from the Woodmen Frontage Road. The

alignment of this connection will be evaluated with the Preliminary Plan

and Final Plat. Deviations for this public connection from the

Engineering Criteria Manual will be evaluated by the Development Services

Department with the preliminary plan and final plat. The Developer will make appropriate road dedications and improvements as determined by the Board of County Commissioners at the

time of subdivision.

The preliminary plan as shown does not meet the condition as written. Further discussion with the County Engineer is necessary to gain support to request the waiver of the Condition if intended by the applicant.

Letter of Intent

1. Identify the preliminary plan approval criteria, Section 7.2.1.D, for this particular application.
2. The applicants intention is to request pre-site grading with installation of wet utilities with this preliminary plan, please justify add the request in the letter of intent.
3. The applicant is proposing a private road which is not in conformance with the Conditions of Approval. Please request that this preliminary plan not meet that condition and justify why if that is the intent.
4. Please be specific when describing what you are preliminary planning: phasing plan, development schedule, relationship between adjacent uses and densities, buffers or mitigation techniques, how many lots, tracts, public roads, private road, regional detention facility which you will seek reimbursement.
5. If the lots do not have physical access to a public road a waiver of the Code is required to be requested from the Board. A waiver of sections 8.4.3,C.e, and 8.4.4. Please justify these waiver requests in the LOI.

Preliminary Plan Map

1. If private road(s) are proposed, they should be placed in a standalone tract. Ownership and maintenance entity should be identified.
2. Identify the minimum 15’ buffer tract adjacent to the existing residential zoned (west and north) property per the Code (Section 6.2.2.D). A waiver of this requirement may not be supported by staff, and has been a lengthy discussion topic at recent hearings.
3. Identify the wall and provide a detail on the plan (Section 6.2.2.D).
4. Please note for future site development plans: all lots fronting Woodmen and Meridian Road are subject to a 25 feet landscape setback. The lots along the internal road (private or public) will require a 10 feet landscape setback. No structures drive isles or paving are allowed within the landscape setback (driveway cuts are allowed).
5. Remove open space from the regional detention tract, and the tracts in the adjacent to existing and future ROW. These tracts are drainage and utility and not intended for use as open space. Provide a tract table with tract label, size, ownership, maintenance and use.
6. Identify the trail easement along Meridian in alignment with the platted Bentgrass Plat to the north. Please work with EPC Parks for alignment.
7. It is not clear graphically which lines are lot lines, roadway lines, dimensions, or easements.
8. Please confirm that all items on the planning application checklist listed on the application are included on the preliminary plan map (Sheet 3). Remove sheet 2 and put that information on sheet 3 please. The missing items from the checklist are below:
* Approximate location, rights of way, width, surfacing, functional classification, and names of existing and proposed maintained and dedicated public and private streets
* Approximate length of street centerlines, radii of curves, centerline grades, and type of curb, gutter and sidewalk
* Approximate location, length, width and use of all existing and proposed easements, utility rights of way, major utility facilities, intersection, bridges, culverts, and drainage ways. Indicate underground facilities
* Approximate location, length, width and type of all non-thoroughfare transportation
* links (e.g. paths, bikeways, trails, PRT, guideways, railroads, etc.)
* Approximate layout, dimensions, angles, land use, and acreage or square footage of each lot, and tract
* The approximate location of land to be conveyed or reserved in deeds for the use

of all property owners, residents, or the general public and the proposed methods of dedication and maintenance of such lands; to include but not be limited to: parks, open space, public streets and thoroughfares, bikeways, paths, trails, schools and school sites, public utilities, and community and social service facilities

* Notes to indicate disposition, maintenance responsibility, and service responsibility (suppliers) for water and sanitation, energy supplies, common areas, and other services and areas which will serve the community must be shown
* Approximate location of existing and proposed structures Approximate location of:
	+ Watercourses, existing bodies of water, and other water forms
1. Please utilize the standard notes below:
* Access Limitation:

There shall be no direct lot access to \_\_\_\_\_Woodmen Road and Merdian\_\_\_\_ Road.

* In Areas of High Groundwater:

Due to high groundwater in the area, all foundations shall incorporate an underground drainage system. No basements are permitted (See CGS comments and report by Ground Engineering).

* + Soil and Geology Conditions**:** (*to be customized based upon the individual circumstances*)

The following lots have been found to be impacted by geologic hazards. Mitigation measures and a map of the hazard area can be found in the report *(Title of Report, generally from the Preliminary Plan file)* by *(author of the report) (date of report)* in file *(name of file and file number)* available at the El Paso County Development Services Department:

Floodplain: (*name lots or location of area*)

Groundwater:*(name lots or location of area)*

* Private Roads:

The private roads as shown on this plan will not be maintained by El Paso County until and unless the streets are constructed in conformance with El Paso County standards in effect at the date of the request for dedication and maintenance.

* Woodmen Road District Note:

All property within this subdivision is within the boundaries of the Woodmen Road Metropolitan District and, as such, is subject to a mill levy, platting fees and building permit fees for the purpose of financing construction of specified improvements to Woodmen Road.

* Easement and Tract Maintenance:

Tract \_\_\_\_\_ shall be utilized as \_\_\_\_\_\_\_(park, neighborhood park, school site, fire station, drainage tract, etc). Ownership and maintenance of Tract \_\_\_\_\_\_ shall be vested to (name the entity: El Paso County, Special District, Homeowners Association, etc.) (Where multiple tracts are included in a single plan or plat, the use of a tract table is encouraged.)

Please include who will own and maintain the private road tract and the buffer tract.

Documents / Reports

1. Adjust the subdivision summary form accordingly based on the comments above please.
2. Modify legal so that it matches the application and the boundary of the plan (one parcel & 36.4 Acres).
3. ERO Natural Features and Habitat Report- No habitat has been identified that would preclude development. Noted.
4. The State Engineer and County Attorney’s Office have not provided comment to date regarding water sufficiency.
5. Geology, Soils and Hazards Report should meet the requirements of Section 8.4.9 of the Code. Verify all specific requirements are included in report. More specifically, (Section 8.4.9 page 8-52) please provide a site specific map in the report to include the preliminary plan layout with the existing hazards (constraints) as identified in the report. An addendum can be completed. Also, provide notes in the report identifying the hazards and mitigation techniques to remove the constraints from the corresponding lots in the preliminary plan. These should also be reflected on the preliminary plan sheet 1 note section.

**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 return of any 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.

General

1. Note: The following are Engineering conditions of approval on the rezone (CR-07-001):
	1. (#1): “A public roadway shall be constructed through the subject property to allow access to Meridian Road from the Woodmen Frontage Road. The alignment of this connection will be evaluated with the Preliminary Plan and Final Plat. Deviations for this public connection from the *Engineering Criteria Manual* will be evaluated by the Development Services Department with the Preliminary Plan and Final Plat.”
	2. (#2): “Outstanding engineering comments identified in a letter to the applicant dated November 02, 2007 shall be addressed with the Traffic Impact Analysis required for the Preliminary Plan.”
	3. (#6): “The Developer will make appropriate road dedications and improvements as determined by the Board of County Commissioners at the time of subdivision.”
2. Letter of Intent:
	1. The Access/Roadways section needs to request that the Board of County Commissioners remove rezone condition of approval #1 and waive LDC requirements (see Planning comments). Provide justification for the road being private including public turnarounds, guarantees of maintenance, adequate pedestrian connectivity, etc. Address the entity proposed to maintain the road (POA?). Deviations required with the proposed road through the site need to be addressed as discussed in the Transportation comments below.
	2. The Drainage section needs to mention that this proposed development will be constructing the sub-regional pond and dedicating it to the County for maintenance.
	3. The last paragraph in the Waiver and Deviation Requests needs to me revised per Transportation comments regarding provision of a turnaround area.
3. Provide the easement documents (or links) referenced in the title work B-2 exceptions.

Preliminary Plan

1. Provide maintenance and ownership entity columns in the Lot/Tract table.
2. Provide a statement regarding developer construction of sub-regional pond SR4 and County ownership and maintenance after completion of construction and County acceptance of the improvements.
3. Provide a note regarding cross-lot access and parking (blanket, or plat-specific).
4. Revise note #6 to reference the latest geotechnical study.
5. Provide a note or notes referencing the latest environmental studies.
6. Label the classifications of the existing surrounding roads (Meridian, Woodmen, Woodmen Frontage, and Eastonville).
7. Label proposed auxiliary lanes and median type in Meridian Road. The TIS seems to show an accel. Lane entering the site at Eastonville Road; please verify.
8. Regarding the proposed private spine road:
	1. Identify the road by name, functional classification and proposed surfacing.
	2. Provide a statement regarding the proposed maintenance entity.
	3. The cross-section right-of-way/easement width does not match the plan labels; revise as appropriate.
	4. If the road through the site is not public, a maintenance turnaround will be required at the end of the Woodmen Frontage Road. Vacation of the current turnaround right-of-way is unlikely unless some other turnaround arrangement is agreed upon.
	5. Verify that the proposed road centerline radii are adequate for an appropriate design speed. Certain design standards may be relaxed for private roads, subject to the approval of the County. Standards subject to deviation (if not covered by a code waiver) shall be limited to:
		1. reduction of right-of-way width where suitable alternative provisions are made for pedestrian walkways and utilities;
		2. reduction of design speed where it is unlikely the road will be needed for use by the general public;
		3. reduction in standard section thickness minimums and pavement type where suitable and perpetual maintenance provisions are made;
		4. variation in maximum and minimum block lengths.
9. Provide a note stating that the future design of Lot 2 will provide landscape islands and drive lanes designed to discourage cut-through traffic between the Woodmen Frontage Road and Eastonville Road.
10. Show proposed sidewalk locations: internal; along Meridian Road; and along the spine road.
11. Preliminary Grading Plan: Adjust the proposed contours to be darker and the existing contours to a dashed linetype.

Transportation / Traffic Impact Study (TIS)

1. The TIS shows total traffic and peak hour movements far exceeding the TIS reviewed with the rezone application, dated October 2, 2007. This TIS needs to be set up to include analyses of all of the intersections in that previous study and comparable tables, including Tables 2 through 7. Provide additional discussion describing the changes from 2007 to the current proposal.
2. Update Table 7 (improvements responsibilities table) to include construction triggers from this development as applicable.
3. Verify whether or not the traffic signal at Meridian and Eastonville is proposed to be constructed with the first final plat connecting that intersection. If it is not, provide additional stop-condition and warrant analyses for the current and short-term conditions at this intersection.
4. The TIS needs to provide acceleration, deceleration, and stopping distances in accordance with current design and posted speeds. If these lengths cannot be met, provide deviation requests for shorter lengths as applicable.
5. Provide the average pass-by trip percentage in the last line of Table 2. Provide comparison to the 2007 study in the narrative.
6. More detailed comments will be provided with the complete TIS. The deviations submitted have not approved or denied pending review of the revised TIS.

Following are applicable November 2, 2007 comments (renumbered) that were remaining to be addressed from the rezone approval (CR-07-001, condition of approval #2). Address as appropriate with the updated TIS:

1. The overall study for the Latigo Area should include a fair and equitable cost from each developer that would need to be determined prior to final plat. This equation should address the cost sharing of all regional improvements. **10/29/07: Many improvements have been identified to develop commercial in the area. Costs that are regional or part of the subarea should be shared among developers. These costs and contributions will be identified with the final plat.**
2. Include improvements table identifying improvement, trigger, and responsible party if regional indicate costs will need to be worked out prior to final plat. **10/29/07: The list should include extending the frontage road through the Gaddie property, installing the roundabout, and the signal at Bentgrass and Meridian (as a sub area cost).**
3. Discuss necessary right of way for proposed improvements and the feasibility of acquiring the necessary right of way along Woodmen, Meridian, and Eastonville. **10/29/07: This will be evaluated with the preliminary plan.**
4. Timing of all the development in the area is important in determining assumptions for study horizons. We want to look at how the area will function as a whole which is being done with Latigo Study and is included in the 2015 and 2030 analysis in this report. This study should also look at how the site will function on its own in the short term and the long term if Bentgrass and Latigo are not constructed (assume traffic from approved applications only). Provide an analysis of full build out traffic without the proposed developments of Bentgrass and Latigo with the right in right out on Woodmen Road. Does this project function without those access points? What improvements would be necessary to accommodate just the traffic from the Gaddie rezone? Would the signal at Eastonville and Meridian be triggered? **10/29/07: Given the timing and phasing of projects in the sub area different scenarios will need to be evaluated with the preliminary plan to identify appropriate phasing.**
5. This report should be stand alone, provide figures for the existing traffic with existing levels of service along with assumed directional distribution for the site and the necessary lane geometry figures for Meridian Road. Include progression analysis for Meridian Road. Include all the necessary discussion and calculations in the report to support recommendations. **10/29/07: Include no build (no development within the subarea except zoning and traffic already approved i.e. existing, Courtyards, Bentgrass PUD, and Latigo Industrial) scenarios for both 2015 and 2030 to establish a comparison at key intersections (i.e. Meridian and Eastonville, Golden Sage and Woodmen, Golden Sage and Woodmen Frontage, etc) this would include no right in right out and no fourth leg at Eastonville. Basically I want a comparison of the result of rezoning Gaddie and Latigo ( right in right out and 4th leg Eastonville/Meridian vs. not). Justify short term peak factor by ECM it should be 0.85 or calculated, address school traffic PHF for Bentgrass.**
6. Levels of service E are shown at the intersection of Eastonville and Meridian Road and Woodmen and Golden Sage. Provide methods of mitigating these unacceptable levels of service. A possible solution is to specify uses to trip generation that would bring the turn lanes into conformance. **10/29/07: These deviations will be evaluated further with the preliminary plan.**
7. References should be included for all studies used in the derivation of background numbers. Include any percent growth assumptions. Include roadway connection assumptions including Stapleton, Banning Lewis, Meridian, etc. **10/24/07: The 2030 background traffic is based upon the Woodmen Road EA. The EA did not take into consideration all the additional density we are now seeing in the Falcon area. Provide a list of assumed developments within the Woodmen EA and add all the additional traffic coming into the area. List of assumptions for staff review. Provide additional analysis with the preliminary plan TIS.**
8. Address impacts of traffic on Courtyards at Woodmen Hills and MVEA. How do access points to these areas function with each horizon? **10/29/07: Address with preliminary plan.**
9. The bandwidths along Meridian are unacceptable even without the addition of Woodmen Road. What are possible methods of improving the bandwidths along Meridian Road? **10/29/07: Note that lead lag phasing of lefts at Eastonville and Meridian as presented in the traffic study is unacceptable, revise. What does elimination of the permissive movement for the southbound left do to the LOS at this intersection? What is the result if you eliminate the lag left?**

Preliminary Drainage Report (PDR) / Drainage Plans

1. Provide all required PDR checklist items (attached). The known missing/incomplete items have been highlighted.
2. Address existing conditions, basins, and design points for comparison to the proposed condition.
3. Address DCM2 Section 4.1 – Four Step Process, and how these steps will be provided for on this site.
4. Discuss runoff flow values and proposed facilities at design points in the report text.
5. Add references to EPC Board Resolution No. 15-042 (El Paso County adoption of Chapter 6 and Section 3.2.1 Chapter 13 of the City of Colorado Springs Drainage Criteria Manual dated May 2014, hydrology and full-spectrum detention) and the 2015 Falcon DBPS.
6. Address how the proposed design accommodates the existing petroleum pipeline and other utilities along the south and east property lines. Provide documentation that the easement holders have no objections to the proposed drainage design.
7. Discuss detention pond maintenance requirements and responsibility, access provisions, and the private maintenance agreement/easement that will be required with the final plat.
8. See redlines regarding pond construction reimbursement.
9. Provide a statement in the Conclusion section that this proposed design will not result in negative downstream impacts.
10. Provide preliminary storm drain, channel, headwater, freeboard and spillway sizing calculations.
11. Geotechnical issues (also see Geotech. study comments below)
12. Page 31 of the geotech. study states that “In no case should water be allowed to pond near or adjacent to foundation elements, hardscaping, utility trench alignments, etc.” Discuss how the proposed drainage design accomplishes this.
13. Address anticipated pond SR4 embankment settlement.
14. Consider replacing the proposed area drain and pipe at the northwest corner with a swale along the north property line to the proposed rundown. Maintenance access appears likely to be difficult as proposed and the geotech. study recommends “properly designed drainage swale” at the tops of excavation slopes.
15. Discuss the required geotechnical and dam analyses appropriate for detention pond SR4. See DCM Sections 6.6, 11.3.3, and Attachment A (Chapter 11).
16. Include copies of the applicable report sections and maps of the 2015 Falcon DBPS and 2016 CLOMR report (including storm drains) for this site in the appendix.
17. Drainage Plan:
18. Provide an Existing Conditions drainage plan. Show and label design points as appropriate for comparison to the proposed plan.
19. Show and label all proposed maintenance access roads and easements on the Developed Conditions Plan.
20. Label (add) the material and slope of the existing culverts.
21. Provide a design point summary of 5- and 100-year flow rates at all surface and pipe design points on both the existing and proposed plans.

Grading and Erosion Control Plan / SWMP / Geotechnical Issues

1. Note: Regarding the request for pre-development site grading (“early grading”), a checklist of final submittal requirements will be provided with comments on the next submittal. The separate Construction Drawing review (CDR-16-007) needs to be complete and those plans approved along with the GEC plans.
2. GEC Plan:
3. Provide all required GEC checklist items (attached). The known missing/incomplete items have been highlighted. You may need to split sheet 2 into two sheets (north and south) or more to show all information and detail required.
4. Delete “Preliminary” in the title on sheet 2.
5. Please use a darker line for the property lines.
6. The existing and proposed contours are the same linetype; adjust the proposed contours to be darker and the existing to a dashed linetype.
7. The limits of disturbance appear to extend into County ROW. More detail is required on what exactly is being done in these areas and a work in the right-of-way permit will be required from EPC Department of Public Works. Temporary construction access to Meridian Road will be at the County Engineer’s discretion.
8. The use of silt fence along property lines not paralleling contours is not recommended unless j-hooks or other terminations are provided to capture the runoff at locations not exceeding the silt fence capacity. Construction fence should be provided if the intent is to limit the work area.
9. Temporary sediment basins are required per DCM2. If the proposed pond areas will be utilized as TSBs, label as such. Provide standard details.
10. Comments on the SWMP/”Grading, Erosion and Stormwater Quality Plan” will be provided with the next submittal. Ensure that all checklist items have been provided.
11. Required forms will be provided by e-mail with the next submittal review or earlier, upon request.
12. Ground Engineering Geotechnical Report dated October 18, 2016:
13. The site plans in this report do not match the proposed Preliminary Plan and sub-regional pond layout; revise as appropriate.
14. There is only one boring in the SR4 pond area, which indicates very shallow groundwater. Recommendations on how to keep the groundwater from infiltrating the pond (which is to be excavated approximately 10 feet deeper than the groundwater level) need to be provided. If a separate geotech. study will be provided for pond construction, let us know.
15. The proposed sub-regional pond is upstream of the proposed buildings. Verify that the recommendation for a low-permeability liner is still adequate for this situation.
16. Note: Comments regarding pavement design for the proposed spine road will be provided with the Final Plat review, dependent on final design/layout and determination of public or private maintenance. Final geotechnical study and review of construction plans by the geotechnical P.E. will be required at the Final Plat stage.

Financial Assurance Estimate Form

1. Provide a Financial Assurance Estimate form including all required GEC items.

Attachments will be emailed

1. Preliminary Plan Redlines
2. Preliminary Drainage Report Redlines
3. GEC Plan Redlines
4. Preliminary Drainage Report Checklist
5. GEC Checklist
6. SWMP Checklist

**Preliminary Drainage Report (PDR) Checklist**

The purpose of the Preliminary Drainage Report is to identify specific solutions to problems onsite and offsite resulting from the development of the subdivision to be platted. In addition, those problems that exist prior to development must be addressed in the preliminary report. The PDR shall be in accordance with the following outline and contain the applicable information listed. Drainage reports must utilize the following format and major headings as noted below.

**Report Contents**

1. Table of contents, pages numbered. [x]

***General Location***

1. City and County, and local streets within and adjacent to the subdivision. [x]
2. Township, range, section, ¼ section. [x]
3. Major drainageways and existing facilities. [x]
4. Names or surrounding platted developments. [x]

***Description of Property***

1. Area in acres. [x]
2. Ground cover (type of trees, shrubs, vegetation). [x]
3. General topography. [x]
4. General soil conditions. [x]
5. Major drainageways. [x]
6. Irrigation facilities. [ ]
7. Utilities and other encumbrances. [ ]

***Major Basin Descriptions***

1. Reference should be made to major drainageway planning studies; [x]

 such as drainage basin planning studies, flood hazard delineation reports,

 and flood insurance studies or maps, if available.

1. A floodplain statement shall be provided indicating whether any portion of [x]

 the development is in a designated floodplain as delineated on the current

 FEMA mapping.

1. Major basin drainage characteristics. [x]
2. Identification of all nearby irrigation facilities and other obstructions which

 could influence or be influenced by the local drainage. [ ]

***Sub-Basin Description***

1. Discussion of historic drainage patterns of the property in question. [x]
2. Discussion of offsite drainage flow patterns and their impact on the

 development. [x]

***Drainage Design Criteria***

1. Reference all criteria, master plans, and technical information used for [ ]

 report preparation and design; any deviation from such material must be

 discussed and justified.

1. Discussion of previous drainage studies (i.e. PDR, drainage basin planning **[x]**

 studies, master plans, flood insurance studies) for the site in question that

 influence or are influenced by the drainage design and how the studies

 affect drainage design for the site.

***Hydrologic Criteria***

1. Identify design rainfall. [ ]
2. Identify runoff calculation method. [x]
3. Identify design storm recurrence intervals. [x]
4. Identify detention discharge and storage calculation method. [x]

***Drainage Facility Design – General Concept***

1. Discussion of compliance with offsite runoff considerations. [x]
2. Discussion of anticipated and proposed drainage patterns. [x]
3. Discussion of the content of tables, charts, figures, plates or drawings

 presented in the report. [ ]

***Drainage Facility Design – Specific Details***

1. Presentation of **existing and proposed** hydrologic conditions including [ ]

approximate flow rates entering and exiting the subdivision with all

necessary calculations.

1. Presentation of approach to accommodate drainage impacts on existing or [ ]

 proposed improvements and facilities.

1. Presentation of proposed facilities with respect to alignment, material and [ ]

 structure type.

1. Discussion of drainage impact of site constraints such as streets, utilities, [ ]

 existing and proposed structures.

1. Environmental features and issues shall be presented if applicable. [ ]
2. Discussion of maintenance access and aspects of the preliminary design. [ ]
3. Discussion and analysis of existing and proposed downstream drainage [x]

 facilities and their ability to convey developed runoff from the proposed

 development.

**Drawing Contents**

1. General Location Map: A map shall be provided in sufficient detail to [ ]

 identify drainage flows entering and leaving the development and general

 drainage patterns. The map should be at a scale of 1”=50’ to 1”=2000’.

 The map shall identify any major construction (i.e. development, irrigation

 ditches, existing detention facilities, culverts, storm sewers, etc.) that shall

 influence or be influenced by the subdivision.

1. Drainage Plan: Map(s) of the proposed development at a scale of 1”=20’ [ ]

 to 1”=200’ shall be included to identify existing and proposed conditions on

 or adjacent to the site in question.

1. The drainage plan shall delineate all sub-basins and proposed initial [x]

 and major facilities as well as provide a summary of all initial and major

 flow rates at design points. All floodplains affecting the site shall be shown.

**El Paso County Grading and Erosion Control Plan Submittal Checklist**

1. Vicinity map. [x]
2. North arrow and acceptable scale (1”=20’ to 1”=100’). [x]
3. Existing and proposed Contours 2 feet or less (except for hillside). [x]
4. Standard EPC Grading and Erosion Control Notes included. [x]
5. Delineate mapped FEMA 100-yr floodplain. [x]
6. Construction site boundaries clearly delineated. [ ]
7. Areas of soil disturbance shown. [x]
8. All proposed construction BMPs and Construction BMP details shown. [ ]
9. Show existing vegetation. [ ]
10. Existing and proposed water courses including springs, streams, wetlands, Detention ponds, roadside ditches, irrigation ditches and other water surfaces. [ ]
11. Show all existing structures. [ ]
12. Show all existing utilities. [ ]
13. Submit geotechnical investigation from soils engineer. [x]
14. Conclusions from soils report and geologic hazards report incorporated in grading design. [ ]
15. Show existing and proposed property lines and site boundary. [ ]
16. All existing and proposed easements (permanent and construction).including required off site easements. [ ]
17. Any offsite grading clearly shown and called out. [ ]
18. Existing and proposed storm drainage facilities as necessary to show all BMPs. [ ]
19. Temporary sediment ponds provided for disturbed drainage areas greater than one acre. [ ]
20. Proposed slopes steeper than 3:1 with top and toe of slope delineated. [ ]
21. Erosion control blanketing shown on slopes steeper than 3:1. [ ]
22. Retaining walls greater than or equal to 4ft in height require design by P.E. and building permit from Regional Building Department. Locations to be shown on the plan (not located in County ROW). [ ]
23. Vehicle tracking shown at all construction entrances. [ ]
24. The erosion control plan is to be certified by a Colorado Registered P.E. with appropriate signature blocks for EPC and the Engineer and the statement “The Owner will comply with the requirements of the Erosion Control Plan” signed by the owner. [ ]
25. Required Signature blocks: [x]

***Stormwater Management Plan Checklist***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  1 | Applicant (owner/designated operator), Prepared By, SWMP Administrator, and Contractor information | [ ]  |
|  2 | Table of Contents | [ ]  |
|  3 | Site description and location to include vicinity map (not just Section, Township, Range) | [ ]  |
|  4 | Narrative description of construction activities proposed (e.g., may include clearing and grubbing, temporary stabilization, road grading, utility / storm installation, final grading, final stabilization, and removal of temporary control measures) | [ ]  |
|  5 | Phasing plan – may require separate drawings indicating initial, interim, and final site phases for larger projects. Provide “living maps” that can be revised in the field as conditions dictate. | [ ]  |
|  6 | Proposed sequence for major activities: Provide a construction schedule of anticipated starting and completion dates for each stage of land-disturbing activity depicting conservation measures anticipated, including the expected date by which the final stabilization will be completed. | [ ]  |
|  7 | Estimates of the total site area and area to undergo disturbance | [ ]  |
|  8 | Soil erosion potential and potential impacts upon discharge | [ ]  |
|  9 | A description of existing vegetation at the site and percent ground cover | [ ]  |
| 10 | The location and description of any other potential pollution sources such as fueling (mobile or stationary), chemical storage, etc. | [ ]  |
| 11 | Material handling to include spill prevention and response procedures | [ ]  |
| 12 | Spill prevention and pollution controls for dedicated batch plants | [ ]  |
| 13 | Other stormwater pollutant control measures to include waste disposal and cleanup of off-site soil tracking | [ ]  |
| 14 | The location and description of any anticipated non-stormwater components of discharge (springs, irrigation, etc.) | [ ]  |
| 15 | The name of ultimate receiving waters; size, type and location of stormwater outfall or storm sewer system discharge | [ ]  |
| 16 | SWMP Map to include: a) construction boundaries | [ ]  |
|  | b) all areas of disturbance | [ ]  |
|  | c) areas of cut and fill | [ ]  |
|  | d) areas used for storage of building materials, soils or wastes (stockpiles) | [ ]  |
|  | e) location of any dedicated asphalt / concrete batch plants | [ ]  |
|  | f) location of all structural BMPs | [ ]  |
|  | g) location of all non-structural BMPs | [ ]  |
|  | h) springs, streams, wetlands and other surface waters | [ ]  |
| 17 | Narrative description of all structural BMPs to be used, including: silt fence, straw bales, check dams, sediment basins, diversion swales, etc. Ensure that methods are ECM/DCM-approved. | [ ]  |
| 18 | Description of non-structural BMPs to be used including seeding, mulching, protection of existing vegetation, site watering, sod placement, etc. | [ ]  |
| 19 | Technical drawing details for BMP installation and maintenance | [ ]  |
| 20 | Procedure for how the SWMP will be revised | [ ]  |
| 21 | Description of final stabilization and long-term stormwater quality measures to control stormwater pollutants after construction operations have been completed | [ ]  |
| 22 | Specification that vegetative cover density is to be a minimum of 70% of pre-disturbed levels to be considered stabilized | [ ]  |
| 23 | Outline of permit holder inspection procedures to install, maintain, and effectively operate BMPs to manage erosion and sedimentation | [ ]  |
| 24 | Record keeping procedures identified to include signature on inspection logs and location of SWMP records onsite | [ ]  |

Please note: all items need to be addressed. If not applicable, explain; simply identifying “not applicable” will not satisfy CDPHE requirement of explanation.

**PIKES PEAK REGIONAL BUILDING DEPARTMENT**

**Enumerations**

1.       The access shown at the north-easterly corner of this development is labeled as Eastonville Rd. but the letter of intent says that the interior road is to be privately owned and maintained.  If this is to be a private road, then the name Eastonville Rd should be removed from the development plan.

2.       If the interior road is not going to be Eastonville Rd, is it intended that this interior road be given a private street name? Is this interior road going to be considered merely a driveway access without a street name?

3.       If there is to be no interior street name, then lots 1,2,8,9,10, and 11 will be addressed from Woodmen Rd, Lots 3,4,5, and 6 from Meridian Rd. , and Lot 7 will receive an address from both streets, with the future building frontage determining which address is used.

4.       If the interior road is going to be named, then addresses may be given from this road as appropriate.

5.       Enumerations will have more comments as this project nears the final plat stage.

**Floodplain**

There is substantial exposure to FEMA identified floodplain on this parcel. The site plan states that a CLOMR has been submitted to FEMA, however, the date shown needs to be corrected. It shows it being submitted in the year 2916. Any questions on compliance with Regional Building Code section RBC313 (Floodplain code) should be directed to Floodplain Administrator Keith Curtis (keith@pprbd.org, 719-327-2898).

**EL PASO COUNTY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**Environmental Division**

The El Paso County Environmental Division has completed its review of the above referenced request . Our review consisted of the following items: wetlands, federal and state listed threatened or endangered species, general wildlife resources and noxious weeds.

1. Request submittal of a copy of the referenced letter dated August 23, 2016 from Van Truan, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers providing Approved Jurisdictional Ruling determining that “the site contains no jurisdictional waters of the United State that are subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act”.
2. The project lies within or adjacent to an area with documented noxious weeds including Canada thistle. It is the applicant’s responsibility, and not El Paso County’s, to ensure compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, including but not limited to the Colorado Noxious Weed Act and the El Paso County Weed Management Plan.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this project. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Kathy Andrew at (719) 520-7879.

**EL PASO COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT**

* Water and wastewater for the property is provided by Woodmen Hills Metropolitan district. According to the water resources report prepared by Drexel, Barrell & Co., Woodmen Hills Metropolitan District confirmed that there is sufficient supply to accommodate property demands.
* Radon resistant construction building techniques/practices are encouraged to be used in this area. The EPA has determined that Colorado, and the El Paso County area, have potentially higher radon levels than other areas of the country.
* Earthmoving activity in excess of one acre, but less than twenty-five acres, will require a Construction Activity Permit from El Paso County Public Health. Go to <http://www.elpasocountyhealth.org/service/air-quality> for more information. If the earthmoving activity is in excess of twenty-five acres at one time, a Construction Activity Permit is required from Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment.

Tara L. Olson

Lead Environmental Health Specialist

El Paso County Public Health

1675 W. Garden of the Gods Rd.

Colorado Springs, CO 80907

Office (719) 578-3286

[www.elpasocountyhealth.org](http://www.elpasocountyhealth.org/)

**EL PASO/TELLER E-911**

If the interior road is going to be named, then Eastonville Rd in the N/E corner is a logical continuation.

If the interior road is not going to be named, then Eastonville Rd in the N/E corner should not be labeled and that access is just an entrance to the shopping center.

If an interior road name is needed, please contact me via email at cchavez@elpasoteller911.org

Connie Chavez, Street Naming

El Paso Teller County 911

elpasoteller911.org

719-785-1900

**EL PASO COUNTY CONSERVATION DISTRICT**

No comment.

**BENT GRASS METROPOLITAN DISTRICT**

Project does not fall into this district.

**WOODMEN ROAD M METROPOLITAN DISTRICT**

In response to the proposed project this parcel will be subject to the Commercial Woodmen Road Metropolitan District Fee’s and mill levies

Platting fees of $1540 x 36.4 (Acre) = $56,056.00

This proposed site would be subject at time of Final Plat Recording, for Woodmen Road Metropolitan District.

We are recommending that this parcel join the Woodmen Road District as it has received its full benefits with the District funding of Woodmen Road.

The land owner will need to contact our office to annex this parcel into the Woodmen Road District prior to recording of final plat.

Please contact our office should there be any questions.

Autumn Mason

autumn@schoolerandassociates.com

Admin Assistant

20 Boulder Crescent Street Ste 200

Office (719) 447-1777

**COLORADO SPRINGS UTILITIES**

CSU has no objection to the request and recommends approval of the Preliminary Plan.

**MOUNTAIN VIEW ELECTRIC ASSOCIATION, INC.**

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

MVEA will require utility easements determined necessary by MVEA to install new facilities and for relocation of existing facilities. The expense of relocation of existing electric facilities will be at the expense of the applicant. MVEA requests platting of existing MVEA facilities with easement on the plat.

If additional information is required, please contact our office at (719) 495-2283.

Cathy Hansen-Lee

Engineering Administrative Assistant

**FALCON FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT**

Upon detailed review of your submittal, the Falcon Fire Department has determined that your submittal required additional information and discussion to determine that is meets the minimum requirements of the 2009 International Fire Code as locally amended however recommends APPROVAL on a preliminary drawing.

**Additional Notes and Requirements:**

**CONTACT:** If you have questions concerning this review, please contact the Falcon Fire Protection District at (719) 495-4050.

**FEES:** The Falcon Fire Department will collect a cost recovery fee associated with Final Commercial Development Plan reviews, fire inspections and administrative services. The fee for development plan review is ***$429.00***. The initial review fee covers services rendered for the first review and a complementary second review, if necessary. It is important to note that if plans requires a third review an additional fee of 1.75 times the original fee will be collected. It is strongly suggested that you ensure all disapproved comments are corrected prior to submitting for a re-review.

Fees shall be paid directly to the Falcon Fire Department located at 7030 Old Meridian Road in Falcon, Colorado.

NOTE: Your construction plans will not be reviewed until the Development Plan review fees have been paid. Please pick up you DP from the Falcon Fire Department.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

GENERAL REVIEWS – Falcon Fire Department reviews fire plans based upon information provided on the drawings and/or the attached reference material. Issues or features that are not presented within the construction documents are assumed to be compliant with applicable codes/standards. It is the responsibility of the building owner to ensure that minimum code requirements are met as established by the Authority Having Jurisdiction, whether of not the requirements are specifically indicated on the submitted construction documents.

The Falcon Fire Department has reviewed this submittal in accordance with the fire code requirements of the 2009 International Fire Code, local amendments, and applicable NFPA Standards. All plan review comments are subject to final on-site field inspections, and testing by the Falcon Fire Department.

WOODMEN ROAD ACCESS NOTE- Falcon Fire Department has worked with the developer on an emergency access point at the proposed right in location off Woodmen road at the Woodmen Road frontage. This proposed access point which will allow emergency access to the residential neighborhood adjacent to the proposed development has been desired by the Fire Department for many years now. We are strongly in support of this woodmen road right in and emergency access location.

TURNING RADIUS: All fire apparatus access roads are to provide a minimum of 33-feet inside and 44-feet outside turning radius. The proposed round about at the Meridian Road Access Point will need to meet this minimum turning radius.

FIRE FLOW – Be advised that fire flow and hydrants shall be provided in accordance with the currently adopted fire code. This is not a water plan or fire hydrant review. Please submit water/hydrant plans to the Falcon Fire Department for review.

PERMITS - Insure all applicable permits are obtained from the Regional Building Department and the Falcon Fire Department before work begins.

150-FT ACCESS: All structures shall meet the access requirement of 150-feet to all portions of the structure on an approved fire apparatus access road. If this requirement cannot be met with existing roads then additional fire access roads shall be provided.

WIDTH: Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20-feet except for approved security gates.

VERTICAL CLEARANCE: Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13-feet 6-inches.

INCREASED WIDTH: Fire apparatus access roads shall be increased in width where proposed widths are inadequate for fire or rescue operations.

LOADING: Fire apparatus access roads shall be designed, constructed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus weighing at least 75,000 lbs, with a minimum single axle weight of 27,000 lbs.

SURFACE: Fire apparatus access roads shall be surfaced so as to provide all-weather driving capabilities by means of asphalt, concrete or other approved driving surfaces. Gravel roads or other alternatives may be acceptable; however, PE stamped engineered specifications for such alternatives, showing that the loading specifications and all weather surface capabilities have been met or exceeded must be submitted and approved.

DEAD-END ACCESS: Dead-end fire apparatus access roads in excess of code says 150-feet shall be provided with a turn-a-round meeting the requirements of 2003 IFC.

FIRE LANE: Fire lane signage shall be provided. Signs shall be a minimum dimension of 12-inches wide by 18-inches high and have red letters on white reflective background. Signs shall be posted on one or both sides of the fire apparatus road as required.

Fire Lane signs shall be installed as follows:

1. On both sides of fire department access roads less than twenty-eight feet (28') wide.

2. On one side of fire department access roads with widths of twenty-eight feet (28') or more but less than thirty-four feet (34'). Fire lane markings shall be on the same side of the road as fire hydrant placement.

3. No signage is required for access roads thirty-four feet (34') or more in width.

FIRE LANE MARKING: Where applicable, approved signs and/or striping shall be provided for fire apparatus to identify such road or prohibit the obstruction thereof. Signs and striping shall be maintained in a clean and legible condition at all times and be replaced or repaired when necessary to provide adequate visibility.

OBSTRUCTED FIRE LANES: Fire apparatus access roads shall not be obstructed in any manner, including the parking of vehicles and construction equipment or materials. The minimum widths and clearances shall be maintained at all times.

GATES: Gates securing the fire apparatus access roads shall comply with all of the following criteria:

1. The minimum gate width shall be 16 feet (4877 mm) or as wide as necessary to facilitate the required minimum turning radius.

2. Gates shall be of the swinging or sliding type.

3. Construction of gates shall be of materials that allow manual operation by one person.

4. Gate components shall be maintained in an operative condition at all times and replaced or repaired when defective.

5. Electric gates shall be equipped with a Knox (TM) key system installed in an approved manner. Electronically operated gates shall have a failsafe, manually operated, Knox (TM) key override switch.

6. Manual opening gates shall not be locked with a padlock or chain and padlock unless they are capable of being opened by means of forcible entry tools.

7. Locking device specifications shall be submitted for approval by the fire code official.

KNOX (TM) KEY: The Falcon Fire Department requires a KNOX ™ entry box on every new commercial building equipped with a fire alarm or fire sprinkler system.

**COLORADO GEOLOGICAL SURVEY**

Subject: Falcon Marketplace Preliminary Plan (File Number SP-17-001)

Falcon Peyton comprehensive plan, El Paso County, CO; CGS Unique No. EP-17-0031

Colorado Geological Survey has reviewed the Falcon Marketplace Preliminary Plan referral. We understand the applicant proposes 11 commercial lots and a regional detention facility on 36.4 acres located northwest of the intersection of Woodmen Road and Meridian Road. With this referral, we received, a Request for Review (El Paso County, January 18, 2017), a Letter of Intent and Preliminary Drainage Report (Drexell, Barrell & Co, January 17, 2017), and a Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation (Ground Engineering, October 18, 2016).

The site does not contain steep slopes, is not undermined, and does not contain, nor is it exposed to, any geologic hazards that would preclude the proposed commercial use and density. However, as identified by the applicant, portions of the property are located within a FEMA 100-year flood zone of Black Squirrel Creek.

**Flooding.** Both the drainage and geotechnical reports identify flooding hazards associated with the 100-year floodplain and the unnamed tributary to Black Squirrel Creek located onsite. The geotechnical report further indicates that the remainder of the site may also be vulnerable to flooding during heavy rainfall and prone to surface ponding due to relatively slow surface drainage. The drainage report indicates that mitigation includes piped flow capture into a sub- regional detention pond, depicted on sheet D-1 of the drainage report. This pond is up-gradient of the site and shown with 0% impervious coverage.

The drainage report indicates onsite runoff will be captured and conveyed by curb and gutter and storm sewers captured in water quality basins, down-gradient of the site, that discharge into a grass-lined channel along the south perimeter of the property. The total system proposed is designed to convey the full 100-year discharge.

* The geotechnical report recommends up-gradient detention pond(s) be lined to prevent infiltration into the subsurface. In addition, they recommend cut-off walls and/or drainage provisions for bedding materials surrounding storm sewer lines flowing to the pond. This is to prevent problems with heave or settlement of nearby soils. This recommendation for a low permeability liner for the sub-regional detention pond #1 and the drainage provisions for storm sewer lines must be followed. These recommendations should be indicated in the drainage report and shown on the preliminary drawings prepared for this project.

**Soil and bedrock engineering properties.** Ground makes appropriate *preliminary* geotechnical recommendations based on the results of nine borings, four test pits, limited SPT’s (standard penetration tests, an *in situ* test indicating relative density), and limited laboratory testing. One tested soil sample exhibited minor swell when wetted under a relatively light 375 psf load. Another tested soil sample exhibited minor consolidation (collapse) when wetted under a load of 1,500 psf.

* Additional geotechnical investigations and analysis will be needed, once building locations are finalized, to more accurately characterize lot-specific soil and bedrock engineering properties such as expansion/consolidation potential, density, corrosion potential, etc. This information is needed to determine subgrade preparation requirements and to design individual foundations, and floor systems.

**Fill and existing buildings.** Ground did not identify specific areas of fill, but indicate that fill may be scattered throughout the site. An existing residence and associated out-buildings are located in the northeast area of the property.

* Historic and recent Google images of the site, indicate a circular feature in the southwest portion of the site that appears to have been graded with fill. Lidar images indicate this circular area is higher than the surrounding ground. This area must be further investigated for the potential of fill materials.
* The development plan produced for this project should clearly indicate locations of existing fill and structures to be demolished and removed.
* All fill material encountered during site grading and within utility trenches, and building foundation excavations will need to be removed and replaced with properly moisture- conditioned and compacted, clean structural fill (free of debris).

**Shallow Groundwater.** Ground measured groundwater from 7 to 13 feet below the ground surface in several of their borings and state that groundwater levels will likely rise at this site after development. Below grade areas should therefore be considered not feasible on this property.

**Provided these and Grounds recommendations are strictly adhered to, CGS has no objection to approval of the Preliminary Plan as proposed.**

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. If you have questions or require further review, please call me at 303-384-2654, or e-mail jlovekin@mines.edu.

Jonathan R. Lovekin, P.G. Senior Engineering Geologist

**Due to the number of comments and necessary revisions to the plan(s) an additional detailed review will be necessary. Please address the comments as listed above. A detailed letter needs to accompany the revisions to allow for an expeditious re-review timeframe. The letter should include each comment listed above and, immediately thereafter, include a response from the applicant addressing the comment.**

**If any review agency has an issue that needs resolution or requires a revision, you will need to provide the necessary documents, drawings, etc., to the Planning and Community Development Department in the form of a resubmittal. The Planning and Community Development Department will then forward the resubmitted items directly to the appropriate review agency. If you have any questions pertaining to specific agency comments please contact the appropriate agency directly.**

**PLEASE NOTE: The application cannot be scheduled for public hearing until and unless a final response has been received by Planning and Community Development from those agencies that are required (pursuant to state statute and the El Paso County Land Development Code) to provide such response (i.e.- State Engineer’s Office, County Attorney’s Office, County Health Department, etc).**

Please contact me if you would like to schedule a meeting with myself or the multi-disciplinary team.

When all the comments have been addressed and corrections made please submit the following revised documents:

5 letters of Intent

5 response letters

5 preliminary plan sets (2 erosion and grading only)

2 of the engineering documents and reports to be revised

3 subdivision summary form

1 legal

3 geology, soils, and hazards addendum

If you have any questions feel free to contact me at 520-6306.

Best Regards,

Kari Parsons

El Paso County Planning and Community Development Department

cc: Jeff Rice P.E.

File: SP-17-001