

November 17, 2023

Ms. Ashlyn Mathy  
El Paso County  
2880 International Circle, Suite 110,  
Colorado Springs, CO 80910

**Re: PCD File No. PPR2329  
The Rock Commerce Center, 1st Review  
Response to Comments**

Dear Ms. Mathy,

Please accept this letter on behalf of Central Development, LLC, the applicant for The Rock Commerce Center. We received your comment letter dated November 9, 2023, regarding the application and we offer the following responses:

Site Plan

*Engineering and Planning Comments*

Sheet 2, Overall Site Plan – Responses were prepared by Redland

1. *Show traffic circulation arrows.*

**Response:** Traffic circulation arrows were added throughout the Site Plan as requested.

2. *Label access width.*

**Response:** The width of the access to Base Camp Road was labeled on the plan as requested.

3. *Please see comments on the Traffic Impact Study regarding access spacing. ECM Chapter 2 Table 2-35 access spacing is not met. Please revise access locations to meet criteria.*

**Response:** The appropriate design vehicle for the south access is a single unit truck per the guidance in the ECM and anticipated truck traffic at the site. Access spacing as designed exceeds the requirement for a single unit truck design vehicle on a 45-mph road. Design vehicle and access spacing discussion has been added to the TIS. Figure 2 has been updated with access spacing distances on site and to adjacent access.

4. Clarify Assessors page shows 10 acres for PID 7111000018.

**Response:** We have reached out to Christian Haas about this comment. We received an ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey by Aztec Consultants Inc. dated 2/23/2023 that states the lot area is 11.609 acres. This survey was attached to the Letter of Intent with the 2<sup>nd</sup> submittal of the Rock Commerce Center.

5. Consider requesting Alternative Parking Ratio (Section 6.25.D.vi). If you can meet those standards, a modified parking ratio of 1 per 1,200 sqft for Warehouse & Distribution would result in a total required parking of 150 spaces. Easier than processing and paying for a separate Admin Relief Application.

*Just add note to this section:*

*147,420/1,200 = 122.85 spaces*

*16,380/600 = 27.3 spaces*

*Total Required with Alternative Parking Ratio = 150 Spaces*

**Response:** We will request an Alternative Parking Ratio to change the warehouse parking requirement to 1 space per 1,200 SF from 1 space per 1,000 SF. The number of accessible spaces will remain the same to follow the original intent of the code.

Sheet 3, Site Plan – Responses were prepared by Redland

6. Show and label culvert under proposed access drive.

**Response:** The culvert under the proposed access drive is now shown and labeled as requested.

Sheet 5-6, Grading Plan – Responses were prepared by Redland

7. Include detail that shows tiered walls, including distance & slope between. Will any walls need a drainage pan to direct flows?

**Response:** The retaining wall detail on this sheet was updated to show the tiered walls including distance and slope between the walls. None of the walls will require a drainage pan. The detail on sheet 6 remains showing a single wall.

Sheet 9, Landscape plan 'A' – Responses were prepared by Stacklot

8. Show and label right-of-way.

**Response:** This label was added as requested.

## Public Improvement Plan Construction Documents

### *Engineering Comments*

#### Sheet 1, Cover Sheet – Responses were prepared by Redland

9. Change “Jennifer Irvine, P.E.” to “Josh Palmer, P.E.” on the El Paso County Signature Block.

**Response:** The County signature block was updated as requested.

#### Sheet C3.0, Horizontal Control Plan – Responses were prepared by Redland

10. Provide detail & dimensions of outlet protection.

**Response:** The riprap was labeled with type, thickness, length, and depth. The MHFD standard detail for riprap was added to the detail sheets at the end of the Public Improvement Plans.

#### Sheet C4.0, Plan and Profile - Responses were prepared by Redland

11. Provide detail & dimensions of outlet protection.

**Response:** The riprap was labeled with type, thickness, length, and depth. The MHFD standard detail for riprap was added to the detail sheets at the end of the Public Improvement Plans.

12. Per ECM Section 4.3.6.A.3 minimum cover over a culvert/storm is 2.0’.

**Response:** The culvert under the proposed access drive was lowered to provide 2 feet minimum of cover for the culvert.

13. Riprap appears to be higher than grading from culvert/FES.

**Response:** The riprap was fixed in the profile view to display correctly.

#### Sheet C6.0, Erosion Control Plan - Responses were prepared by Redland

14. Provide riprap depth and thickness.

**Response:** The riprap was labeled with type, thickness, length, and depth. The MHFD standard detail for riprap was added to the detail sheets at the end of the Public Improvement Plans.

15. Provide riprap depth and thickness.

**Response:** The riprap was labeled with type, thickness, length, and depth. The MHFD standard detail for riprap was added to the detail sheets at the end of the Public Improvement Plans.

## Grading and Erosion Control Plans

### *Engineering and EPC Stormwater Comments*

#### Sheet 1, Cover Sheet – Responses were prepared by Redland

16. Change “Jennifer Irvine, P.E.” to “Josh Palmer, P.E.” on the El Paso County Signature Block.

**Response:** The county signature block was updated as requested.

17. Provide sheets for construction of pond.

**Response:** A pond details sheet was added to the end of the Grading and Erosion Control Plan set.

#### Sheet 4, Grading Plan – Responses were prepared by Redland

18. Label riprap outlet protection, Provide riprap type, depth, and thickness.

**Response:** The riprap was labeled with type, thickness, length, and depth.

#### Sheet 5, Initial Erosion Control Plan – Responses were prepared by Redland

19. Add shading to legend “area of cut”.

**Response:** The shading was added to the legend and the area of cut was added to the legend as requested.

#### Sheet 6, Initial Erosion Control Plan – Responses were prepared by Redland

20. Extend construction fence to the limits of disturbance.

**Response:** The construction fence was extended to the outside of the limits of disturbance. The construction fence was not extended into Base Camp Road.

## Sheet 7, Interim Erosion Control Plan – Responses were prepared by Redland

21. I didn't see the concrete drainage pan detail. Comment Response stated that it was on Sheet 5. I believe that is just the diversion ditch detail. Include 2' and 10' concrete drainage pan detail on this sheet.

**Response:** The concrete drainage pan details were added to these sheets from the Site Development Plan, Grading Plan Sheets.

## Sheet 8, Interim Erosion Control Plan – Responses were prepared by Redland

22. Provide pond details including but not limited to: Forebay, outlet structure, Trash rack and orifice plate, spillway, trickle channel, pond bottom, maintenance access road, and riprap outlet protection.

**Response:** A pond detail sheet was added to the Grading and Erosion Control Plan set. It does not encompass all of the mentioned details listed above. Full construction details will be included in the Construction Document set for approval.

23. Show final erosion control figures (seeding, mulching, pavement, ECB, etc.) For clarification, do not show cut/fill shading or other temporary BMPS.

**Response:** A Final Erosion Control Plan was added to the plan set to show seeding, mulching, permanent erosion control blanket, and pavement. All temporary BMPs were labeled to be removed in this Final Erosion Control Plan.

24. Label riprap outlet protection.

**Response:** The riprap was labeled with type, thickness, length, and depth. The MHFD standard detail for riprap was added to the detail sheets at the end of the Public Improvement Plans.

## Final Drainage Report – Responses were prepared by Redland

### Engineering and EPC Stormwater Comments

25. The assessor's site shows the lot as being 10 acres. Please revise or discuss how total was determined.

**Response:** We have reached out to Christian Haas about this comment. We received an ALTA/NSPS Land Title Survey by Aztec Consultants Inc. dated 2/23/2023 that states the lot area is 11.609 acres. This survey was attached to the Letter of Intent with the 2<sup>nd</sup> submittal of the Rock Commerce Center.

26. LOI and TIS state the building area as 163,800 sf, please revise for consistency

**Response:** The building area in the Final Drainage Report and Traffic Impact Study were updated to represent the correct building square footage.

27. The Design point flow summary states 3.0 & 7.27 cfs for the 10- & 100-year storms at Design Point A. Please revise statement if you are referring to basin flow only. Similar comment for other basins described in this section.

**Response:** The basin flows discussed in this section are just basin flows and not the routed flows at the design points. A discussion stating this distinction was added to this section of the Report.

28. According to paragraph above the release rate is 10.4 cfs.

**Response:** The release rate was updated in this paragraph to be consistent with the previous paragraph.

29. Include calculation/description of how 10.16 acres of impervious area was determined.

**Response:** A table showing how the impervious area was calculated was added to Appendix of this Report.

30. *The summing the drainage fees and bridge fee can be removed since the bridge and drainage fees are always kept separate.*

**Response:** The line summing the bridge fee and the drainage fee has been removed and the two fees are kept separate as requested.

31. Include Design Point RC1 in DP Summary Table on basin map.

**Response:** Design Point RC1 was added to the Design Point Summary Table on the Proposed Drainage Map.

Traffic Impact Study – Responses were prepared by Fox Tuttle Transportation Group

## *Engineering Comments*

32. *Indicated if any deviations are needed.*

**Response:** Standard compliance section has been added. No deviations are requested.

33. *Provided for analysis for Deer Creek/Woodmoor intersection. Improvements are planned there for County Project. Need to show how much traffic this project will contribute to this intersection. Escrow may need to be provided based on traffic impacts. Contact John Lantz ([johnlantz@elpasoco.com](mailto:johnlantz@elpasoco.com) or 719-520-6883) at EPC Capital Improvements Projects for more information on this project.*

**Response:** Contacted John Lantz and no response about the intersection improvements has been received to date. A discussion of the project-added trips at Deer Creek Rd and Woodmoor Dr has been added to the TIS.

34. *Include discussion for Woodmoor at SH105. Is there a large enough traffic increase or improvements needed to warrant a CDOT access permit?*

**Response:** Discussion of traffic increase and operations with the project-added trips has been added to TIS. A CDOT Access Permit is not warranted.

35. *As noted at beginning of report, this intersection may be upgraded to a roundabout. Project needs to show what % of traffic it will increase, as it may need to escrow an amount to help with future improvements.*

**Response:** See response to comment #33. Percentage increase of traffic at the intersection has been added to TIS.

36. *Please see comment regarding access spacing on page 18 of 184.*

**Response:** The appropriate design vehicle for the south access is a single unit truck per the guidance in the ECM and anticipated truck traffic at the site. Access spacing as designed exceeds the requirement for a single unit truck design vehicle on a 45-mph road. Design vehicle and access spacing discussion has been added to the TIS. Figure 2 has been updated with access spacing distances on site and to adjacent access.

37. *Per ECM Appendix B.8 state what the applicable road impact fees are and time of payment.*

**Response:** Comment has been added in the TIS explicitly regarding road impact fees. The proposed showroom use of this project is not directly called out in the ECM Road Impact Fee Schedule. Recommend discussion between County staff and project owner to determine the appropriate road impact fee for this project.

38. *The access spacing is approximately 541'. Per ECM Chapter 2 Table 2-35 and Table 2-36 the minimum spacing should be 765' for commercial land use on a 45-mph road. Please see table 2-35 for further information. Access shall be spaced to meet criteria.*

**Response:** The appropriate design vehicle for the south access is a single unit truck per the guidance in the ECM and anticipated truck traffic at the site. Access spacing as designed exceeds the requirement for a single unit truck design vehicle on a 45-mph road. Design vehicle and access spacing discussion has been added to the TIS. Figure 2 has been updated with access spacing distances on site and to adjacent access.

39. *Label Proposed access as north/south per report for consistency.*

**Response:** Directional labels have been added for clarity.

40. *Provided access spacing between proposed accesses and closest intersections*

**Response:** Access spacing has been added to Figure 2.

41. *Please have signature over PE stamp.*

**Response:** Change made.

42. *Please move signature sheet behind the cover sheet and fill out developer signature block.*

**Response:** Change made.

Financial Assurance Estimate Form – Responses were prepared by Redland

## Engineering Comments

43. *Verify quantity of pedestrian Ramps.*

**Response:** There are 3 pedestrian ramps located in between the building and the parking in front of the building. These ramps provide the accessible route to the building from the accessible spaces.

44. *Provide Landscaping quantities.*

**Response:** The landscaping quantities were provided and added to the Financial Assurance Estimate by Stacklot.



# Redland

WHERE GREAT PLACES BEGIN

If you have any questions regarding the above response to comments, please contact me at 720-283-6783 ext. 136 or at [mcevaal@redland.com](mailto:mcevaal@redland.com).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Mark D. Cevaal".

Mark D. Cevaal, P.E.  
Sr. Project Manager