



SAGE DESIGN GROUP

Site Planning
Landscape Architecture
Entitlement

www.sagedesigngroup.com

5.22.24

May 22, 2024

City of Lone Tree Public Works and Planning Department

9220 Kimmer Drive, Suite 100
Lone Tree, CO 80124

RE: RidgeGate Amenity Center (SP22-49R) – 5th Submittal Comments

Dear Mr. Samson and Mr. Corder:

Thank you for your review of our Ridgegate Amenity Center SIP Plan. Please find review comments below, with applicant responses in **red**.

City of Lone Tree Public Works

Contact: Andrew Samson, PE

SIP:

No Comments

Response: Thank you for your review.

CDs:

Various portions of sidewalk do not meet 2% maximum cross slope.

Response: Sidewalk has been confirmed to meet 2% cross slope. Slope labels now depicted in the area highlighted in the City comments.

Please show how pedestrians can access the sidewalk from the ADA ramp shown at the bottom.

Response: ADA ramp configuration revised to provide pedestrian access.

Sheet 11: Turn on existing contours if contour elevations are being labeled

Response: Existing contours are now turned on.

Sheet 16: To ensure a proper connection when tying into the existing pipe, either put a collar around the connection or shift the manhole so that the existing pipe ties in directly.

Response: Manhole cannot be shifted because it would then fall within the dry utility easement on the east side of Lyric Street. Storm Plan and Profile labels have been updated to state a collar is to be installed around the connection.



GESC Plan:

Minimum depth of VTC is 50', please extend as required.

Response: VTC now meets the minimum 20' width, 50' length dimensions.

GESC Report:

No comments

Response: Thank you for your review

Drainage Report:

First 3 pages are duplicated

Response: Duplicate pages have been removed.

Page 4 Table 2: Existing map summary in appendix had 3.36 acres, Q₅=7 cfs, and Q₁₀₀=14.1 cfs for basin A25, please confirm and update table accordingly.

Response: The tables on Page 4 are intended to compare the total impervious area of the Amenity Site from what was approved in the previously approved Filing 1 study to what is now proposed. The existing map summary in Appendix D from the Filing 1 drainage report details the total area of basin A25 as 3.36 acres. Of this 3.36 acres, 3.26 acres of basin A25 lies within the Amenity site property boundary. In order to make an accurate comparison, only the 3.26 acres of basin A25 from the previous study that lies onsite is compared to the proposed impervious area of the 3.26 acre amenity site.

Section IV.A: Please discuss/compare what the total flow is in the proposed conditions at these design points

Response: Flows for all referenced design points in section IV.A have been included in the section's text. Flows (Q₅ and Q₁₀₀) for each design point in IV.A match what was calculated in the SF-3 forms in Appendix B – Hydrologic Calculations.

Section IV.A: Please provide the name of the existing structures from the existing SWMM model to verify tailwater starting elevations

Response: Tie in structures from the existing SWMM model "Junction S_A26, Inlet DPA31-2, and Plug DPA45-1" have been provided in the text of section IV.A. Note that the names of the structures provided here are from the Filing 1 SWMM model, and do not match the structures in the StormCAD model for this Amenity Site report.

Please include StormCAD plan view to verify how these structures/pipes correspond to the CDs labeling

Response: StormCAD plan view has been added in Appendix C (before flex tables). Onsite structure names have been verified to match the P&P callouts.

RIM elevations do not appear to all match their P&P callouts

Response: Elevation (Ground) (ft) from the FlexTable: Manhole Tables in Appendix C reflect the rim elevations called out on P&P. Names of certain structures and StormCAD plan view have been provided to more easily confirm.



Plan view of the StormCAD will help verify which structures correspond to P&P. Right now it is tough to tell if Structure DPB-3 corresponds to the sump inlet located in Basin B-3. If so, StormCAD calls out RIM=6037.19 and P&P has RIM=6040.86. Additional comments could be generated after plan view provided.

Response: Names verified and plan view added for clarity. The structure located in Basin B3 is DPB-2 (reference stormCAD planview/profiles) and in the flex tables displays an elevation of 6040.86, reflecting what is shown in P&P.

Structure DPB-3 corresponds to the inlet in Basin B4, which P&P as well as StormCAD flex tables reflect as a Rim elevation of 6037.18.

Various basins differ from the summary table in the report.

Response: Table 1. Proposed Basin Summary Table now reflects the summary table in the basin map from Appendix E. Section II.A Minor Basin Description also displays the same information.

Douglas County Department of Community Development

Addressing Comments

The proposed address for this facility is 10930 Lyric Street. This address is not to be used for any other purpose other than plan review until after this project is approved. Proposed addresses are subject to changes as necessary for 911 dispatch and life safety purposes.

Addresses are recorded by Douglas County following all necessary approvals. Send confirmation of project approval to this office by email. Contact DCAddressing@douglas.co.us or 303.660.7411 with questions.

Response: Address information has been noted, thank you for your review

South Metro Fire Authority

Contact: Scott Stene

A full NFPA 13 fire sprinkler system will be installed in the café/sales center.

Response: Noted, thank you for review. The Civil water distribution plans will show a dedicated fire sprinkler line connection from the building to the water main.

Provide auto-turn analysis

Response: An Autoturn analysis has been provided and will be uploaded to SMFR's Accela system for permit.

A separate commercial water distribution system permit is required from SMFR

Response: Noted, we will upload plans to SMFR's Accela system for a commercial water distribution system permit.

Separate buildings will require separate addresses.

Response: Noted, thank you for your review



SAGE DESIGN GROUP

Site Planning
Landscape Architecture
Entitlement

www.sagedesigngroup.com

5.22.24

Xcel Energy

Contact: Violeta Ciocanu

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the Site Improvement Plan for **Lyrice Amenity Center**. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing natural gas and electric distribution facilities along property lines.

The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities via xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details.

Additional easements may need to be acquired by separate document (i.e. transformers) – be sure to ask the Designer to contact a Right-of-Way & Permits Agent in this event.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the Utility Notification Center by dialing 811 for utility locates prior to construction.

Please contact me should you have any questions or concerns regarding this response letter at 303-267-6220.

Response: Noted, thank you for your review

Code Compliance

Contact: Sam Waggener

First comment is regarding the percentage of genera for Quercus and Gleditsia, both of these are above the 25% threshold the City requires in the [City's Design Guidelines and Standards](#) on page 20 General Provisions. It states GP-B Select plants for biodiversity, no one plant shall make up more than 25% of the total non-turf plant material on site, currently the number of genera for Quercus is 33% and for Gleditsia is 32%. I am getting these figures by only counting tree species, one way to get around this would be to increase the amount of tree species. My next comment is regarding tree species and the selection of Gleditsia, these species are overplanted within the City, and I would suggest planting another species in its place. Species that are good shade replacements include: Kentucky Coffee tree, Turkish Filbert/Hazelnut, Ginkgo, Goldenrain tree, Sensation Boxelder, Japanese Lilac 'Ivory Silk', and northern Catalpa.

Response: We have adjusted the species to hit the 25% diversity in Code by adding the Kentucky Coffee Tree in the Amenity Center and the Red Maple in the tree lawn and at the western vehicular entry and eastern pedestrian entry. The Red Maple was used in all the approved ROW plans in the tree lawn. We have kept the Gleditsia as it is a proven tree that survives in parking lot conditions and puts down good amounts of shade. The Gleditsia is not on the forbidden planting list of the City of Lone tree.

Next comment is regarding the use of Buckthorns, this species can be considered an invasive species in areas of the United States. Many of these species produce berries and are spread by birds, this species in particular produces berries that are inedible. This species are not pollinator friendly, providing little ecological benefits compared to other species. Also, these are very susceptible to Japanese beetles and can lead to severe decline, after a few years of stunted growth, these shrubs will need to be replaced, one for one. Some other shrubs to consider are stated below. But one in particular, Utah serviceberry is about the same size and are an important species for native invertebrates. The only buckthorn species that I would allow is native to Colorado and the specific species is Smith's Buckthorn *Rhamnus smithii*.



SAGE DESIGN GROUP

Site Planning
Landscape Architecture
Entitlement

www.sagedesigngroup.com

5.22.24

Other species to consider replacing the buckthorns include: Rabbit Brush, Newport plum, Chokecherry, Black Chokecherry, Elderberries, Golden Currant, Wax Currant, Alpine Currant, American Plum, Cliffrose, Smoke bush, New Mexico Locust, Silver Buffaloberry and Russet Buffaloberry.

Response: We have added the Golden Elderberry along the North side of the pool and Upright Red Chokeberry on the east side of the pool. On the south end of the pool, we feel we need to keep the Buckthorns as they are the best screening plant for tight spaces. The south end of the pool will be the most visible area to pedestrians and parked vehicles, and we feel we need the extra screening the buckthorns provide. The Columnar and Finline Buckthorn are not on the City of Lone Tree forbidden planting list or the noxious list put out by the Colorado Department of Agriculture.

PWSD

Civil and site plans do not meet PWSD requirements for plan review, please see attached description of necessary callouts and information in order to review plan and comment appropriately. Checklist attached for your reference."

Response: A PWSD submittal will be done separate of this Site Plan submittal that will conform to the PWSD checklist.

City of Lone Tree Planning Department

Provide dimensions available for loading space- show that it meets the 12 feet wide and 18 feet long code requirement.

Response: We have updated our delivery route exhibit to show dimensions that meet the code.