



July 07, 2018

Catherine E. Trotter, AICP, Town Planner  
Town of Fraser  
PO Box 370  
Fraser, CO 80442

**RE: Planner Briefing on The Meadows at Grand Park**

Dear Ms. Trotter,

On behalf of Cornerstone Winter Park Holdings, Terracina Design, David Evans and Associates, and Topknot Civil & Structural Engineering have reviewed the comments dated May 17, 2018 for the Meadows at Grand Park-Preliminary Plat and Final Plan Development Plan submittal. The Final Planned Development Plan and Final Plat application resubmittal package attached is for your review. The following is a response to comments.

**Staff received the following comments from Rod McGowan, Town Attorney:**

1. This appears to be a resubmittal of the subdivision/Final Plan proposal submitted in 2015 for The Meadows, although the property configuration has been changed. A copy of Rod McGowan 's previous review memo is included in the packet.  
**RESPONSE: Noted.**
2. The documents refer to a preliminary plat submittal, but the proposed plat is designated as a final plat. **RESPONSE: An updated application will be provided for the request of a final plat.**
3. The proposed plat would create a disconnected parcel where the berm and GP monument signs are located. Since this parcel is being divided, it should be included within the plat boundaries and assigned a parcel/tract identifier. **RESPONSE: This will become a tract as a part of this submittal.**
4. This proposed subdivision will add traffic on Old Victory Road (and possibly Grand Park Drive). To complete the connection to the east end of the development. There is ample support under the terms of the Annexation Agreement and POD Plan to make that determination. **RESPONSE: This comment has been addressed at the previous Planning Commission (5/23/18). The completion of Old Victory Road will not occur as a part of this submittal.**

5. The Final Plan shows proposed townhomes on the north side of Haymeadow Road, but no application materials for a townhome subdivision are included. It is assumed that a further subdivision application will be submitted for such townhome development. **RESPONSE: The application will be updated to include townhome subdivision materials**
6. Note 3 on sheet 1 of 7 on the Final Plan refers to "this development permit..." The Final Plan is not a development permit and that note should be deleted. **RESPONSE: Note has been deleted.**

**Staff offers the following comments:**

1. As referenced above, this is not a development permit so general notes 11-13 on the Final Plan sheet 1 of 8 need to be deleted. **RESPONSE: Notes have been deleted.**
2. CDOT is requiring a traffic study. See email correspondence from Dan Roussin, CDOT Permit Unit Manager for Traffic and Safety. **RESPONSE: Updated traffic study is now provided.**
3. Section 17-5-40 lists additional Preliminary Plat requirements for condominiums, townhomes and apartments. It is assumed that a further subdivision application will be submitted for the townhome development referenced in the narrative. **RESPONSE: Additional preliminary plat requirements have been addressed in the revised plans.**
4. The Tracts are labeled different letters on the plat and final plan. **RESPONSE: FPDP will be revised to match platted tract labeling.**

**General**

1. A geotechnical investigation specific to this property needs to be completed, a required in Section 14-2-20 of the Town Design Standards. **RESPONSE: The Geotechnical investigation is currently being obtained and will be submitted as soon as it is completed.**
2. An Engineer's Opinion of Probable Cost needs to be completed. **RESPONSE: Now provided.**

3. A Signage & Striping Plan needs to be submitted. **RESPONSE:**A signage and striping has been included in the construction set.
4. A Lighting Plan needs to be submitted. **RESPONSE:** A lighting plan is now provided.
5. An updated Traffic Study needs to be completed with updated proposed units. **RESPONSE:** An updated traffic study is now provided.
6. A COOT access permit will be required at the US40 proposed intersection and must be provided to the Town prior to recording the final plat. **RESPONSE:**The owner is coordinating with CDOT regarding the access permit.
7. The proposed dead-end water main is almost 2,000 ' which far exceeds the maximum allowable dead-end line of 500'. Further justification of this design variance is required. **RESPONSE:** The sewer and water services designs have been finalized. Profiles have been provided to clarify proper depth and utility clearances.
8. The plans should be signed/stamped by a Colorado Licensed Engineer. **RESPONSE:** The plans have been signed/stamped by a Colorado Licesned Engineer.
9. It's unclear what is being proposed for parking at the townhome units. Please clarify. **RESPONSE:**Parking is now noted on the site plan. Parking Calculation chart has been added.
10. The Town water model will be updated to incorporate this new development and determine if any deficiencies are identified in the existing and proposed system. This analysis will be completed by the Town Engineer with fees passed onto Applicant. **RESPONSE:** Noted.
11. Additional investigation into the impacts this development will have on the Town's existing sanitary system will need to be explored prior to final plat approval. **RESPONSE:** Noted

#### **Final Plat**

12. Tract descriptions should be provided on the plat, it seems that tract D and tract G are intended as drainage easements. **RESPONSE:** The plan has been revised and primary drainage is no longer going through these easements.
13. Tract labels should agree with the construction plans, there is a discrepancy in labeling. **RESPONSE:** Labels revised
14. Trail easement for Fraser Trail should be indicated on the Plat. Easements to the on-site monitoring well heads shall be provided, if they are to be owned by the Town. **RESPONSE:** Trail is located outside of the Final Plat boundary.

#### **Final Planned Development Plan**

15. Sheet 3 of 7: The planning area data chart dwelling units per acre seem to be incorrect. **RESPONSE:** Chart has been double checked for errors. The chart now provided shows the correct values.
16. Sheet 3 of 7: The snow storage areas cannot be located on the sidewalks or proposed driveways. Please revise with functional snow storage locations and area. **RESPONSE:** Snow storage has been revised to avoid driveways and sidewalks.

**Preliminary Construction Plans (SEE ATTACHED RESPONSE FROM TKE)**

17. Sheet 2 of 21: Clarify why standard water note 1a was deleted. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
18. Sheet 5 of 21: Previous drainage studies utilized for this study should be included in the References list. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
19. Sheet 6 & 7 of 21: The proposed sidewalk should tie into the existing asphalt path at both ends of the project. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
20. Sheet 7 of 21: Update tract labels. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
21. Sheet 7 of 21: Add more design detail to proposed acceleration and deceleration lanes. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
22. Sheet 8 of 21: There is a building outline missing. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
23. Sheet 9 of 13: Indicate location of water valve for fire hydrant near Sta 19+50. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
24. Sheet 10 of 21: The pond in tract B does not seem to have any drainage going to the pond. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
25. Sheet 13 of 21: Confirm radius of curb returns meet Sec 14-3-70(2). **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
26. Sheet 14 of 21: The proposed automatic flushing valve shall be detailed, including: valves, freeze protection, outlet location, metering of water use, power, access, etc. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
27. Sheet 15 of 21: Ensure MH rims are not installed in the concrete gutters. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
28. Sheet 15 of 21: Indicate 1.5' of vertical separation at water and sewer main crossing near Sta 0+95. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
29. Sheet 15 of 21: Profiles shall indicate design cover over pipe and insulation if cover is substandard. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
30. Sheet 17 of 21: Confirm that culverts meet the 1% minimum slope and the spacing between the pipes equal  $\frac{1}{2}$  the diameter. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
31. Sheet 17 of 21: Add note that existing monitoring wellheads to be protected during construction. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
32. Sheet 19 of 21: Typical road section should show 10' utility easements on both sides of road, as indicated in the Plat. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**

**Drainage**

33. The drainage map should include contours for the entire proposed site. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
34. Add existing culverts information (including bike trail and highway culverts) including size, slope and capacity to the final drainage calculations. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
35. The culvert designs need to be finalized including: hydraulic calculations (where necessary), size, material (RCP is required in roads), grades, cover, inverts, etc. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
36. More detailed information is needed for the ponds including: cross-section and

- proposed material layers, outlet structure design, berm and overflow weir cross-sections, dimensions and/or horizontal control, etc. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
37. Address potential issues with groundwater elevations and performance of sand filter basins. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
  38. Percolation tests will be required for the design engineer to confirm that sand filter basins are a viable water quality treatment option for this site. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
  39. The design engineer shall recommend inspection, maintenance and filter replacement schedule to ensure that the proposed sand filter basins continue to perform as designed. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
  40. It appears this development is in the path of the existing pond overflow pathways. The location of existing pond overflows needs to be indicated on the plans and downstream infrastructure shall be designed to ensure that pond overflow locations are controlled and not allowed to impact downstream infrastructure (particular attention should be paid to pond overflow near Sta 18+00 - 19+00). **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
  41. There are two distinct drainage systems that convey flows from the upstream drainage basins flowing through (and adjacent to) the development and it appears that the proposed grading plan is potentially re-directing these flows. It's not clear in the current study the quantity of stormwater runoff being conveyed to these systems. This needs to be clarified. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
  42. Proposed drainage channel (including cross-section at Sta 2+95) and culvert capacity calculations shall be provided. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
  43. It appears that a culvert should be installed at the intersection of Road A and Old Victory Road. Please clarify. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
  44. Additional information should be included to further explain the statement that "reserve capacity is available" for stormwater detention in the existing ponds, including explanation of how water levels in the ponds will be controlled to maintain additional volume for detention. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
  45. Design flows at design point JB should combine the surface runoff from upstream basins and the flows from the adjacent pond(s) overflowing. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
  46. The Applicant is proposing to not detain stormwater runoff, which appears to be acceptable considering the minor increase in stormwater flows and because there are no downstream properties between this property and the river. A formal variance request shall be submitted, per Town Code Section 14-6-20, including a discussion about the capacity of the downstream infrastructure. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
  47. Original Drainage Study from HCE and attached FEMA map show 100-year flows from Leland Creek impacting this development, but this does not appear to be addressed in the drainage report. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**

48. Total volume of Sand Filter Basins is short of the calculated required volume on spreadsheet. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**
49. Based on the proposed grading it appears that flows from design point JB are conveyed to design point US40-B, but design flows would indicate otherwise. This needs to be clarified. **RESPONSE: (TKE)**

END OF RESPONSES

Please feel free to call myself or any member of our team with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Layla Rosales". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Layla Rosales  
Principal