

Planning Division  
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300  
Aurora, Colorado 80012  
303.739.7250



July 12, 2023

James Spehalski  
Melcor/TC Aurora LLC  
9750 W Cambridge Pl  
Littleton, CO 80127

**Re: Third Submission Review – Harmony 6**  
Master Plan Amendment, Infrastructure Site Plan, Site Plan and Plat  
Application Number: **DA-1925-14**  
Case Numbers: **2013-7001-07; 2023-6001-00; 2023-4001-00; 2023-3001-00**

Dear Mr. Spehalski:

Thank you for your third submission, which we started to process on June 21, 2023. We have reviewed your plans and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments and community members.

There are several outstanding comments that remain; however, they can be addressed in a technical review after your administrative decision. Please revise your previous work and send us a technical submission after your decision.

The tentative Administrative Decision date for this application is set for August 2, 2023. Public notice of this decision is required to be mailed and posted at least 10 calendar days prior to the decision date (no later than July 23, 2023). Public notice signs and mailed notice will be prepared by staff and ready for pick-up on or after July 19, 2023. Please post the signs per the instructions included with the signs. The mailed notice is required to be sent to all registered neighborhood organizations within one mile of this development and all abutting property owners. Staff will provide an updated list of registered neighborhood groups with the notice. Please obtain an updated list of abutting property owners from Arapahoe County for this notice. Note that all noticing requirements are the responsibility of the applicant. Any failure to notice will require the application decision date to be rescheduled to comply with the noticing requirements of the UDO.

Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a cover letter specifically responding to each item. The Planning Department reserves the right to reject any resubmissions that fail to address these items. If you have made any other changes to your documents other than those requested, be sure to also specifically list them in your letter.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at 303-739-7121 or [dosoba@auroragov.org](mailto:dosoba@auroragov.org).

Sincerely,

Dan Osoba, Planner II  
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Garrett Graham, PCS Group  
Brit Vigil, ODA  
Filed: K:\\$DA\1925-14rev3



## *Third Submission Review*

### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

#### **1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns**

- 1A. Two outside agency referral comments were received from Xcel Energy and CDOT. Please include a response to those comments with your next submission.

#### **2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application**

##### *Avigation Easement*

- 2A. Continued advisory comment for tracking: Execute the avigation easement and resubmit it in your next review. Staff will route the document to be recorded ahead of the plat.

##### *Site Plan Comments*

##### *Sheet 1*

- 2B. Please clarify what superscript 4 is referencing or remove it if needed.

#### **3. Zoning and Subdivision Comments**

- 3A. Zoning and Subdivision comments have been addressed.

#### **4. Streets and Pedestrian Comments**

- 4A. Streets and Pedestrian comments have been addressed.

#### **5. Parking Comments**

- 5A. Parking comments have been addressed.

#### **6. Urban Design Comments**

- 6A. Urban Design comments have been addressed.

#### **7. Landscaping Issues** (Tammy Cook / 954-684-0532 / [tdcook@auroragov.org](mailto:tdcook@auroragov.org) / Comments in bright teal)

##### *Landscape Plan Comments*

##### *Sheet L0.0*

- 7A. Please explain why these sheets are included on this Key Map but are not included in the set of plans.

### **REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

#### **8. Civil Engineering** (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7304 / [jbingham@auroragov.org](mailto:jbingham@auroragov.org) / Comments in green)

##### *Site Plan Comments*

##### *Sheet 1.1*

- 8A. Revise to "CO", the previous comment had a typo.  
8B. Revise to "street".

##### *Sheet 2.0*

- 8C. If the couplet remains on the next submittal, the section shall meet COA standards. Any deviation requires City Engineer approval.  
This section does not match any COA standard, nor does it match the street shown on sheet 14.  
The sidewalk within a tract would not be considered a public sidewalk.
- 8D. If this section is only intended for the loop lane, please label it as such.
- 8E. The sidewalk associated with the loop lane is private.
- 8F. Indicate if there are easements for the loop lane on the section. The tract for N. Riverwood Ct. appears to be much larger than 43'.



*Sheet 2.8*

- 8G. Label this sidewalk as private.
- 8H. Remove this ramp.

*Sheet 2.9*

- 8I. Repeat Comment: The minimum radius for a one-way couplet with one lane is 425'. One viable solution would be to remove this section of the roadway.

*Sheet 2.12*

- 8J. Repeat: Is this sidewalk being proposed with a different site plan? Please include the case number if so. As of April 3, 2023, aerial imagery does not show this sidewalk as existing. Please provide the sidewalk up to the crossing.

*Infrastructure Site Plan Comments*

*Sheet 7*

- 8K. Please revise the sidewalks to the previous configuration. The sidewalks adjacent to the street can be public and the sidewalks within the tract should be privately owned and maintained with no sidewalk easement associated.

*Sheet 9*

- 8L. Please revise the sidewalks to the previous configuration. The sidewalks adjacent to the street can be public and the sidewalks within the tract should be privately owned and maintained with no sidewalk easement associated.

**9. Traffic Engineering** (Steve Gomez / 303-739-7336 / [segomez@auroragov.org](mailto:segomez@auroragov.org) / Comments in amber)

*Traffic Impact Study*

- 9A. Update the Recent Traffic Studies section per the study that was finalized in March 2023.
- 9B. Verify the Site Plan intersection laneage is consistent with the TIS language.

*Site Plan Comments*

*Sheet 1.1*

- 9C. Add the following note: The developer is responsible for signing and striping all public streets. The developer is required to place traffic control, street name, and guide signs on all public streets and private streets approaching an intersection with a public street. Signs shall be furnished and installed per the most current editions of The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and City Standards and shown on the signing and striping plan for the development.

*Sheet 2.1*

- 9D. Provide a note to defer ramps until the intersection is signalized.

*Sheet 2.5*

- 9E. In coordination with any Postal Service requirements, mail kiosks shall be located:
  - Outside of sight triangles as defined by COA Roadway Manual, standard TE-13
  - Outside of the influence area (including traffic queues) for a controlled intersection (stop-controlled, signal controlled, or otherwise)
  - A minimum of 30' away from stop signs (for stop sign visibility)
  - A maximum of 50' away from curb ramp crossings (curb ramps to be located on both sides of the roadway)
  - Preferred location for mail kiosks is on side lots or other common areas for a neighborhood, and while meeting the above criteria, to avoid conflicts with mail kiosk traffic and specific homeowner ingress/egress



- The United States Postal Service (USPS) must be included in the final determination for placement of mail kiosks within your site, what equipment is USPS approved and what is not.
- Please contact the USPS Growth Coordinator @ 303-853-6994

9F. Move the mail kiosk out of the intersection area.

*Sheet 2.9*

- 9G. Reverse the arrow direction.
- 9H. Add W12-1 sign.
- 9I. Move the mail kiosk out of the intersection area.
- 9J. Place R3-1 (no right turn).
- 9K. Add an R5-1 sign for traffic coming south.
- 9L. Replace with R4-7b & R5-1 signs.

*Sheet 2.10*

- 9M. Verify that the pedestrian ramp edge-to-edge alignment is provided.
- 9N. Move the mail kiosk out of the intersection area.

*Infrastructure Site Plan Comments*

*Sheet 2*

- 9O. Provide and callout base roadway pavement markings, including auxiliary storage lane lengths, taper rates/lengths, and lane widths. Verify with the TIS.
- 9P. Show the interim roadway tie-ins, including pavement markings.
- 9Q. This is shown as 3/4 movement access in 2024. Provide appropriate signing, pork chop island, etc.

*Sheet 3*

- 9R. Note to defer the ramp until the intersection is signalized.
- 9S. Note to defer ramp until receiving ramp is provided.
- 9T. Provide and callout base roadway pavement markings, including auxiliary storage lane lengths, taper rates/lengths, and lane widths. Verify with the TIS.
- 9U. Show the interim roadway tie-ins, including pavement markings.

*Sheet 4*

- 9V. Show a tie-in or barricade to the east side for interim condition.
- 9W. Show the intersection laneage per the TIS.
- 9X. This is shown as 3/4 movement access in 2024. Provide appropriate signing, pork chop island, etc.

*Sheet 6*

- 9Y. This is a 3/4 movement intersection per TIS provide appropriate signing, pork chop island, etc.

*Sheet 7*

- 9Z. An exclusive NB right turn was identified in TIS. Update intersection laneage per TIS.

**10. Fire / Life Safety** (Mike Dean / 303-739-7447 / [mdean@auroragov.org](mailto:mdean@auroragov.org) / Comments in blue)

*Subdivision Plat Comments*

- 10A. In reviewing note #5 and the need for a dedicated fire lane easement within each of the listed tracts I would recommend the removal of the fire lane portion of this easement since there is adequate emergency access to within 150' of all exterior portions of each structure within this site.
- 10B. Tracts L, M, N, S, T, V, and W do not require a fire lane easement.
- 10C. Per the plat, Tract N is called out as a fire lane, public access, and utility easement. If this is correct, provide a dashed line delineation of this easement's boundaries. If it meets a public street standard, which it appears to, the plat will need to be revised to remove the fire lane easement from Tract N.



- 10D. Per the plat, Tract N is called out as a fire lane, public access, and utility easement. If this is correct, provide a dashed line delineation of this easement's boundaries. If it meets a public street standard the plat will need to be revised to remove the fire lane easement from Tract N.
- 10E. This area appears to be intended for vehicular parking and should be removed from the easement boundaries.
- 10F. The roadway appears to have a 32' width flowline to flow-line. This presents as a public street and not a fire lane public access easement. Please confirm.
- 10G. Tract M is not part of the fire lane easement.
- 10H. C205 must be at least 29' since it is an inside turning radius.

#### *Site Plan Comments*

##### *Sheet 1.0*

- 10I. Change the IBC construction type from 2015 to 2021.
- 10J. Change the IBC occupancy class from 2015 to 2021. Change IBC to IRC since these structures are being built under the currently adopted Residential code.

##### *Sheet 1.1*

- 10K. Remove note 18. Addressing is addressed in note 8.
- 10L. Change 2015 to 2021.
- 10M. Change 2009 to 2017.
- 10N. Townhomes fall under the Revised HB=1221 requirements and must include an implementation plan, note, and data table.
- 10O. Please review the attached 2003 Revised HB-1221 with CCICC commentary.pdf. See the redlines for details.
- 10P. Add the note and data table per the redlined stamp.
- 10Q. Remove details and only show on civil plans.

##### *Sheet 2.0*

- 10R. Show the existing fire hydrant in this area.
- 10S. Show the fire hydrant in this location.
- 10T. Per the plat, Tract N is called out as a fire lane, public access, and utility easement. If this is correct, provide a dashed line delineation of this easement's boundaries. If it meets a public street standard the plat will need to be revised to remove the fire lane easement from Tract N.
- 10U. Please note, tract N is called out by the plat as a fire lane, public access, and utility easement. If this is correct label this section detail accordingly. If it is an approved street type, please label it accordingly.
- 10V. Fire Lane is not required in Tract's L, M, N, S, T, V, or W. A request to remove the fire lane from these Tracts is shown within the Plat.

##### *Sheet 2.10*

- 10W. Check with the City of Aurora Civil Engineer to determine if an additional curb ramp will be required in this area per the code section listed below.

#### *Landscape Plan Comments*

##### *Sheet LI.2*

- 10X. There is a fire hydrant and tree conflict.

#### *Infrastructure Site Plan Comments*

##### *Sheet I*

- 10Y. Remove notes from ISP called out on the redlines.

**11. Aurora Water** (Daniel Pershing / 303-739-7646 / [ddpershi@auroragov.org](mailto:ddpershi@auroragov.org) / Comments in red)*Site Plan Comments**Sheet 1.0*

- 11A. Master Utility Study Amendment was not uploaded with this round of review. Please ensure the routing and sizing on this site plan matches the approved MUS amendment.
- 11B. The site plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the preliminary drainage report is approved.

*Infrastructure Site Plan Comments**Sheet 2*

- 11C. Label capped utility and clarify if this is to be installed as a part of this ISP or the Site Plan. TYP for all stubs.

**12. Real Property** (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / [mbrooks@auroragov.org](mailto:mbrooks@auroragov.org) / Comments in magenta)*Site Plan Comments**Sheet 2.3*

- 12A. This easement should not be dedicated to the public R.O.W. unless this is a 'Private' easement (delete these lines).
- 12B. Traffic Signalization Easement - match the Plat.

*Sheet 2.4*

- 12C. This easement should not be dedicated in the public R.O.W. unless this is a 'Private' easement (delete these lines)

*Subdivision Plat Comments*

- 12D. Do not indicate what these tracts are to be used for or who the owner will be. You can't dedicate a tract to anyone, other than the city, via your plat.
- 12E. Change this name - confirm the name with Aurora Water.
- 12F. Move this statement to the Legends on the graphic pages.
- 12G. Delete this Note - It is not a Plat Note in the Subdivision Plat Checklist.
- 12H. See the Advisory Comment on this page.
- 12I. (Advisory Comment) Send in the updated Title Commitment to be dated within 30 calendar days of the plat approval date. (This Commitment should be submitted at the time of your final submittal of the electronic Plat for recording.)

(Advisory Comment) Send in the Certificate of Taxes Due to show they are paid in full up to and through the plat approval date of recording. Obtained from the County Treasurer's office. (This Certificate of Taxes should be submitted at the time of your final submittal of the electronic Plat for recording.)

- 12J. This is not needed outside of the first page.
- 12K. Change this name - confirm the name with Aurora Water (typ.).
- 12L. Add the other Water easements - according to Aurora Water Dept.
- 12M. This is not needed outside of the first page.
- 12N. Change this name - confirm the name with Aurora Water (typ.).
- 12O. Add the other Water easements - according to Aurora Water Dept.
- 12P. This is not needed outside of the first page.
- 12Q. This easement should not be dedicated in the public R.O.W. unless this is a 'Private' easement (delete these lines).
- 12R. This name may change - confirm this with Aurora Water.
- 12S. Add the other Water easements - according to Aurora Water Dept.
- 12T. Change this name - confirm the name with Aurora Water (typ.).
- 12U. This is not needed outside of the first page.



- 12V. Add distance on both sides of a Lot or Tract line.
- 12W. Add the other Water easements - according to Aurora Water Dept.
- 12X. Change this name - confirm the name with Aurora Water (typ.).
- 12Y. This is not needed outside of the first page.
- 12Z. This easement should not be dedicated in the public R.O.W. unless this is a 'Private' easement (delete these lines).
- 12AA. This name may change - confirm this with Aurora Water.
- 12BB. Show this easement line arc length on this side of the Lot line.
- 12CC. Is this easement needed?
- 12DD. Add the other Water easements - according to Aurora Water Dept.
- 12EE. Change this name - confirm the name with Aurora Water (typ.).
- 12FF. This is not needed outside of the first page.
- 12GG. Add the other Water easements - according to Aurora Water Dept.
- 12HH. Change this name - confirm name with Aurora Water (typ.).



**Right of Way & Permits**

1123 West 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue  
Denver, Colorado 80223  
Telephone: **303.571.3306**  
Facsimile: 303. 571. 3284  
[donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto:donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

July 6, 2023

City of Aurora Planning and Development Services  
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Aurora, CO 80012

Attn: Daniel Osoba

**Re: Harmony 6 - 3rd referral, Case # DA-1925-14**

Public Service Company of Colorado's Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk acknowledges the revised utility easement widths for **Harmony 6**.

No resubmittals are necessary.

Donna George  
Right of Way and Permits  
Public Service Company of Colorado dba Xcel Energy  
Office: 303-571-3306 – Email: [donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto:donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)



# STATE OF COLORADO

## Traffic & Safety

Region 1  
2829 W. Howard Place  
Denver, Colorado 80204



COLORADO  
Department of Transportation

Project Name: **Harmony Development**

Print Date:

Highway:

Mile Marker:

### Traffic Comments:

The response to comments didn't address CDOT Traffic concerns. It looks like possibly 30% of the trips from this development is going to get on and off of I-70. This is around 100 vehicles in the AM and 150 vehicles in the PM. Will this impact the interchange at this location unknown.

Jason Igo 7/7/2023

It doesn't look like they updated the TIS based on the comments. I don't see a response to the comments to know there explanation.

Jason Igo 4/18/2023

I don't think it matters but the trips generated are all slightly off. It is less than 5 vehicles and is probably an error rounding but extra 10-20 vehicles should not really change the results.

Trip distribution is weird. It has 30% heading north on Powhaton Rd. in the short term. Where are they going to head too? That road ends at 26th and doesn't have an interchange to I-70. Will these trips impact CDOT roadways. It looks like it will impact E-470 interchange.

The masterplan TIS that was done in June it was requested to have Airpark looked at. There is no comments that were shared with CDOT addressing this comments or an updated TIS.

Jason Igo 1/30/2023

This TIS did not include Airpark interchange. This should be included in the analysis. It is projected to send almost 10,000 trips a day to the interchange with over 550 per the peak hour. This is a lot of additional traffic at the interchange.

Jason Igo 8/3/2022

### Resident Engineer Comments:

No comments.

KMD\_4\_14\_23

-----

I have no comments for this revision.

KM\_1/27/23



Permits Comments:

4-17-2023, We need a comment response letter addressing prior comments. We need to know if prior comments have been addressed before making new comments.

--Steve Loeffler, 4-17-2023

**The project indirectly impacts CDOT Highways. I question the traffic distribution in the TIS, and believe far more traffic from this bedroom community will migrate to/from I-70 and the interchanges thereon on a daily basis. I repeat my previous recommendation that the City encourage Harmony to enjoin the emerging districts as part of the overall public improvement feasibility-funding strategy to upgrade the interchanges along I-70. I did not see any written statement or commitment for this in the PIP or other documents provided.**

- RS 01-13-23

The importance and priority to complete 6<sup>th</sup> Ave/Parkway from Powhatan to Monahan cannot be understated. The System Level Studies for both the Harvest (Aerotropolis) and Monaghan / I-70 interchanges anticipate this essential arterial connection to alleviate and divert heavy traffic now reliant on I-70 for east-west connectivity. While not part of the CDOT system network, 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue is an important East-West connection for peak hour commuting. PA 6 & 7 flank this missing link in the sub-regional roadway system. Traffic from this development is anticipated to migrate to both the Aerotropolis & Monaghan interchanges which 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue is anticipated to facilitate.

We support this roadway and to prioritize its completion, not only for the residents of Harmony, but for the improved access it will serve to the surrounding community. Whereby traffic from Harmony was assumed to be served by the I-70 interchanges as part of the system level study, we suggest that the City encourage Harmony to enjoin the emerging districts as part of the overall public improvement feasibility-funding strategy.

RS 07-25-22