

Cherne, Curtis

From: Cherne, Curtis
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 1:18 PM
To: Wolfe, Bryan K.; Curran, Kevin J.
Cc: Cloud, Jack W.
Subject: RE: KB Home Settlement Agreement

Bryan/Kevin,
Question on Anderson Heights Unit 9.

The agreement states that "...the approved engineering plans under the current Unit 9 Subdivision final plat will remain effective for such subsequent final plat and not require further approval"

If they are going to change the lot sizes, the lots will have to be regraded, which usually means an updated grading plan is required.

Is requiring a revised grading plan allowed per the agreement?

Curtis

↓
Settlement agreement Fee
C19/D001Y
a

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE



October 5, 2007

Diane Hoelzer, PE
Mark Goodwin & Associates
P.O. Box 90606,
Albuquerque, NM 87199

Re: Anderson Heights Subdivision Unit 9 Revised Grading Plan

Engineer's Stamp dated 9-10-07, (N8/D3B)

DOOLE DZ

Dear Ms. Hoelzer,

Based upon the information provided in your submittal dated 9-10-07, the above referenced plan is approved for Grading Permit. This is now the plan that must be certified for Release of Financial Guarantee.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 924-3986.

Sincerely,

Bradley L. Bingham, PE
Principal Engineer, Planning Dept
Development and Building Services

C: file

P.O. Box 1293

Albuquerque

New Mexico 87103

www.cabq.gov



D. Mark Goodwin & Associates, P.A.
Consulting Engineers

P.O. BOX 90606, ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87199
(505) 828-2200 FAX 797-9539

July 27, 2007

Mr. Brad Bingham
Hydrology Department
City of Albuquerque
PO Box 1293
Albuquerque, NM 87103

N08D006 DZ

Re: Anderson Heights Unit 9 Grading Plan (Revised 7.21.07)

Dear Mr. Bingham:

A revised grading plan is being submitted as a result of the following changes:

1. Transportation comments at DRC changed the road profiles enough that the approved grading plan needed to be revised to reflect these changes in order to maintain proper drainage to the streets.
2. Grades were raised in the southeast corner to allow for enough cover over the storm drain in Pitoche Avenue and Kula Ring Street.
3. The existing retaining wall along the east property line was constructed by others and was not high enough to accommodate the revised grades along the Unit 9 boundary, so a second retaining wall along the east property line is necessary.

Along with the revised grading plan I am submitting a 'cheat sheet' to show the difference in grades between the originally approved plan done by Greg Krenik dated 4-14-05 (Sheet 6 and 7) and 4-27-05 (Sheet 9).

Please call me if there are any problems with these revisions or if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

MARK GOODWIN & ASSOCIATES, PA

Diane Hoelzer, P.E.
Senior Vice President
DLH/dlh