

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



February 24, 2023

Randy Bauer  
Clayton Properties Group II / Oakwood Homes  
4908 Tower Road  
Denver, Colorado 80249

**Re: Third Submission Review: Prairie Point Site Plan No 1 (Kings Point North) – Site Plan and Plat**  
**Application Number: DA-1609-22**  
**Case Numbers: 2022-4045-00, 2022-3066-00**

Dear Mr. Bauer:

Thank you for your third submission, which we started to review on February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2022. 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.

Since several issues remain, you will need to make another submission. 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.

Your estimated Planning Commission hearing date is set for April 12<sup>th</sup>, 2022. As the hearing date approaches, remember to coordinate with your case manager regarding the notice of pending administrative decision and administrative decision hearing signs. The notice of the Planning Commission hearing is required to be sent to abutting property owners at least 10 days prior to the decision date and the signs are required to be posted on-site a minimum of 10 days prior to the decision date.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at 303-739-7132 or [egates@auroragov.org](mailto:egates@auroragov.org).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Erik Gates".

Erik Gates, Planner I  
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Layla Rosales, Terracina Design  
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison  
Cesarina Dancy, ODA  
Filed: K:\SDA\1600-1699\1609-22rev3



## *Third Submission Review*

### **SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS**

- Storm drain development fees totaling **\$195,268.42** are due. [Aurora Water/ TAPS]
- Provide the specific landscape design for the curbside landscape. [Landscaping]
- The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved. [Civil Engineering]
- Provide sight triangles at all intersections. Remove markings and signs where indicated. [Traffic Engineering]
- The plan must show the two points of access with a looped water supply to each phase of the development. [Fire/ Life Safety]
- Ensure that the utility infrastructure improvements shown are consistent with the ISPs. [Aurora Water]
- A suitable/safe turf play area is required. Specify playground equipment and provide at least one special piece of play equipment to satisfy the inclusive access requirement. [PROS]
- Provide certificate of taxes due and the title commitment dated within 120 days of plat acceptance. See the site plan and plat for numerous minor labeling corrections. [Real Property]

### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

#### **1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns (Comments in teal)**

- 1A. (Matthew Spiro / 303-530-1308 / [drspiro@yahoo.com](mailto:drspiro@yahoo.com)) - The mitigating wall between Aurora Parking and Valley Hi must be included. That wall is inextricably linked to the 2002 south ward movement of Aurora Parkway from its original 1988 location. Is it shown in the approved 2008 plan. Matthew Spiro also provided a letter as a comment, which has been included, in full, at the end of this review letter.

#### **2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application (Comments in teal)**

[Landscape Plan Page 9]

- 2A. Fix this overlapping text.

#### **3. Zoning and Land Use Comments (Comments in teal)**

- 3A. Rezoning application materials received. There were no additional zoning or land use comments on this review.

#### **4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues (Comments in teal)**

- 4A. There were no streets or pedestrian issues identified on this review.

#### **5. Parking Issues (Comments in teal)**

- 5A. There are no comments related to parking in this review cycle.

#### **6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues (Comments in teal)**

- 6A. There were no architectural or urban design issues on this review.

#### **7. Signage Issues (Comments in teal)**

[Landscape Plan Page 19]

- 7A. The maximum height of neighborhood signs is 6 ft.

- 7B. Dimension these signs.

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

[Landscape Plan Page 2]

- 8A. Revise the street tree numbers on the curbside landscape area table per the markups.

[Landscape Plan Page 3]

- 8B. None of the Street trees are provided in groups, every single tree is a different variety. Consider grouping 3 to 5 trees of the same variety for some consistency.



- 8C. Provide the specific landscape design for the curbside landscape. Refer to Section 146-4.7.5C Curbside Landscaping. This is typical for all streets.
- 8D. Label sight triangles.  
[Landscape Plan Page 4]
- 8E. Provide CN# for PA-3 Future Development Tract C. [2 comments]  
[Landscape Plan Page 5]
- 8F. Provide CN# for PA-3 Future Development Tract C.  
[Landscape Plan Page 9]
- 8G. Utility conflicts with street trees, please adjust.  
[Landscape Plan Page 10]
- 8H. Add dimension for landscape buffer.  
[Landscape Plan Page 16]
- 8I. Add note: Refer to curbside landscaping on Sheet LP-3.  
[Landscape Plan Page 19]
- 8J. Provide specific material call-outs and colors for each detail. City staff does not have access to construction documents.  
[Landscape Plan Page 21]
- 8K. Provide specific material call-outs and colors for each detail. City staff does not have access to construction documents.  
[Landscape Plan Page 22]
- 8L. This must be removed. The exact square footage of each front yard sod area shall be called out.
- 8M. Turkish Filbert does not do well in this area.
- 8N. Specify if it is to be a shade tree or ornamental.
- 8O. Specify if one ornamental and one shade tree to be included.
- 8P. Identify how many of each. [7 comments]
- 8Q. Note: the number of ornamental grasses in the curbside landscape cannot exceed 40%, some of the numbers noted above exceed 40%.
- 8R. For each typical: Identify how many perennials and how many orn. grasses.  
[Landscape Plan Page 23]
- 8S. The exact square footage of each front yard sod area shall be called out. [3 comments]
- 8T. This graphic seems to indicate one ornamental tree and one shade tree. If this is the intent, show this in the planting typical on the previous sheet.
- 8U. It would be recommended that the larger lot include at least one shade tree as there is more space for a shade tree.  
[Landscape Plan Page 24]
- 8V. The exact square footage of each front yard sod area shall be called out. [2 comments]

**9. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7271 / [pcturner@auroragov.org](mailto:pcturner@auroragov.org))**

- 9A. CAD received but needs confirmation of street names including one custom street name.

**REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

**10. Civil Engineering (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / [KTanabe@auroragov.org](mailto:KTanabe@auroragov.org) / Comments in green)**

- [Site Plan Page 1]
- 10A. The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.  
[Site Plan Page 13]
- 10B. Remove references to Xcel for street lighting on public streets. The new Roadway Manual has been adopted and includes COA standards for poles and fixtures.  
[Site Plan Pages 23-26]
- 10C. Label slopes and provide contour labels for existing and proposed contours.  
[Site Plan Page 32]
- 10D. Label slopes in loop lane.



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

[Site Plan Throughout]

11A. Provide sight triangles at all intersections, per COA TE-13, that include public ROW, typ. 2. verify driveways are located a min 75' from intersecting street flow line, typical.

[Site Plan Page 5]

11B. Provide crosswalk per TE-12.

[Site Plan Page 6]

11C. Remove signs and markings. [2 comments]

11D. Verify driveway is min 75' from Nova Dr FL.

[Site Plan Page 7]

11E. Can a pedestrian walkway be placed here to encourage ped pathway through neighborhood?

11F. Remove signs and markings.

11G. Are there any opportunities to direct these pedestrian pathways to the curb ramps as opposed to ending in a location that does not have an ADA crossing?

11H. If ped path is extended through western tract, provide curb ramps/crosswalk.

11I. Can a midblock curb ramp/crosswalk be provided here to accommodate the ped path to park?

[Site Plan Page 8]

11J. Remove this striping.

[Site Plan Page 9]

11K. Remove this striping. [2 comments]

11L. Keep this crossing.

[Site Plan Page 10]

11M. Remove signs and markings.

11N. Callout signs and add advance ped crossing signs. [2 comments]

[Site Plan Page 11]

11O. Remove signs and markings. [2 comments]

11P. 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 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 kiosk within your site, what equipment is USPS approved and what is not. Please contact the USPS Growth Coordinator @ 303-853-6994.

[Landscape Plan Page 3]

11Q. Previous comment not addressed. Provide sight triangles at all intersections involving public ROW per COA TE-13 requirements, typical.

[Landscape Plan Page 5]

11R. Move mailbox out of intersection area.

11S. 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 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 kiosk within your site, what equipment is USPS approved and what is not. Please contact the USPS Growth Coordinator @ 303-853-6994.

[Landscape Plan Page 9]

11T. Move mailbox out of intersection area.



11U. 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 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 kiosk within your site, what equipment is USPS approved and what is not. Please contact the USPS Growth Coordinator @ 303-853-6994.

**12. Fire / Life Safety** (William Polk / 303-739-7371 / [wpolk@auroragov.org](mailto:wpolk@auroragov.org) / Comments in blue)

[Site Plan Page 1]

12A. Add the ICC code edition to the occupancy/construction type.

12B. Please verify that IIB will be the construction type.

[Site Plan Page 14]

12C. The plan must show the two points of access with a looped water supply to each phase of the development. Please revise the phasing plan to identify how the looping of the water mains will be established during each phase.

**13. Aurora Water** (Nina Khanzadeh / 303-883-2060 / [nkhanzad@auroragov.org](mailto:nkhanzad@auroragov.org) / Comments in red)

[Site Plan Page 14]

13A. Utilities to be installed per approved MUS.

[Site Plan Page 15]

13B. Appears that the utility infrastructure improvements in Aurora Pkwy are not included in the ISP east set.

[Site Plan Page 16]

13C. This 24" utility work is not included in ISP east.

[Site Plan Page 17]

13D. Where are the easements?

13E. If public, this needs an easement.

[Site Plan Page 18]

13F. Is this symbol correct?

13G. If public, this needs an easement.

[Site Plan Page 20]

13H. 5 ft clear needed.

[Site Plan Page 21]

13I. Ensure 5 ft separations between hydrants and any other meters/obstructions- TYP all sheets.

13J. Confirm these dashed lines indicate ROW limits- TYP all utility sheets. The legend to the right does not confirm that.

13K. Meters to be in ROW or in pocket utility easements.

[Site Plan Page 22]

13L. What are these manholes for?

13M. Inlet in middle of ROW?

**14. TAPs** (Diana Porter / 303-739-7395 / [dsporter@auroragov.org](mailto:dsporter@auroragov.org))

14A. Storm Drain Development fees due 157.221 acres x \$1,242.00 = \$195,268.42.

**15. Forestry** (Rebecca Lamphear / 303-739-7177 / [rlamphea@auroragov.org](mailto:rlamphea@auroragov.org) / Comments in purple)

15A. Waiting for bond for escrow trees and mylars.

**16. PROS** (Curtis Bish / 303-739-7131 / [cbish@auroragov.org](mailto:cbish@auroragov.org) / Comments in mauve)

[Site Plan Page 28]

16A. 4.1% Slope is too steep for the multi-purpose turf area. Regrade and incorporate retaining walls if necessary to provide functional space.



[Landscape Plan Page 16]

- 16B. A suitable/safe turf play area is required. Either introduce retaining walls where necessary to achieve a proper slope or swap the location of field to the east where it is flatter. Other programmatic elements of the park might better fit on the west side based on the topography, especially since the steeper slopes could be native grass area. Alternatively, a slope not exceeding 2% will be required for a minimum 160' x 225' area.

[Landscape Plan Page 17]

- 16C. Next submittal should: \* Demonstrate that separate play areas with age appropriate equipment for pre-school (ages 2-5) and school-age children (ages 5-12) are provided. \* Specify playground equipment. Each structure should be identifiable with callouts corresponding to detail sheets. \* Include at least one special piece of play equipment to satisfy the inclusive access requirement. See Section 6.22.B(1) of the PROS Dedication & Development Criteria Manual for guidance.
- 16D. Include the design/type/manufacturer of the picnic shelter on the detail sheet.

**17. Real Property** (Roger Nelson / 720-587-2657 / [ronelson@auroragov.org](mailto:ronelson@auroragov.org) / Comments in magenta)

[Site Plan Page 3]

- 17A. Label all tracts as indicated on the plans.

[Site Plan Page 5]

- 17B. Label tract and area.

[Site Plan Page 10]

- 17C. License agreement will be required for any portion of this wall within an easement.

[Plat Page 1]

- 17D. Provide certificate of taxes due.

- 17E. Provide title commitment date within 120 days of plat acceptance.

[Plat Page 2]

- 17F. Describe the monument that the cap was found on per AES Board Rule. (i.e. rebar diameter, pipe diameter, etc.)

- 17G. Move "Unplatted" text down to avoid overplotting.

- 17H. Show controlling ROW monument and fully describe the monument and cap and stamping. Also label B&D/Curve Data?

- 17I. Label B&D?

- 17J. Add line #14?

[Plat Page 5]

- 17K. Make text legible.

- 17L. Contact Andy Niquette [decactionproperty@auroragov.org](mailto:decactionproperty@auroragov.org) for the easement concerns.

[Plat Page 7]

- 17M. Describe the monument that the cap was found on per AES Board Rule. (i.e. rebar diameter, pipe diameter, etc.)

- 17N. Label the area where indicated.

[Plat Page 8]

- 17O. Label the area where indicated.

[Plat Page 9]

- 17P. Label the area where indicated.

- 17Q. Utility or Pipeline easement?

[Plat Page 10]

- 17R. Contact Andy Niquette [decactionproperty@auroragov.org](mailto:decactionproperty@auroragov.org) for the easement concerns.

[Plat Page 11]

- 17S. Label area where indicated.

[Plat Page 15]

- 17T. Is this being dedicated by this plat?

- 17U. Controlling monument?

[Plat Page 16]

- 17V. Label Easement B&D's?

[Plat Page 17]

- 17W. Label existing easement B&D's (Typical)



17X. Label area where indicated.

[Plat Page 18]

17Y. Label area where indicated.

17Z. Label existing easement B&D's (Typical)

17AA. Is this portion of the U.E. being dedicated by separate document?

17BB. Label Road Name & ROW width.

17CC. Label easement.

**18. E-470 Public Highway Authority** (Chuck Weiss / 303-537-3420 / [cweiss@E-470.com](mailto:cweiss@E-470.com))

19A. No additional comments were received from the E-470 Public Highway Authority.

**19. Mile High Flood District** (Laura Hinds / 303-455-6277 / [submittals@udfcd.org](mailto:submittals@udfcd.org))

20A. MHFD staff have no objections to the referenced project at the present time. We appreciate the opportunity to review this application and look forward to reviewing Channel C2 in further detail as the drainage design progresses.

**20. CDOT** (Steve Loeffler / 303-757-9891 / [steven.loeffler@state.co.us](mailto:steven.loeffler@state.co.us))

20A. Please see the attached comments from CDOT.

The building department is currently considering a plan that removes the masonry mitigating wall protecting Valley Hi from Aurora Parkway in Kings Point North - now called Prairie Point. The wall has been in every plan revision for at least the past 15 years and this is a break with 35 years of building department mitigation precedent. As my HOA wrote in a recent letter, this is "egregious and unacceptable".

While the current developer claims there is an issue of an electrical right of way or easement, it is simply not believable that the wall cannot be built because of a few electrical poles. This is a 900 acre development with nearly 2000 homes and a PGA level golf course. Those power lines are obviously going to be buried and moved as part of the development. To suggest that a half-dozen small electrical poles are standing in their way is laughable.

Furthermore, the current 2008 plan that includes the wall was fully vetted and approved by the City. The utility companies, Xcel and CORE (formerly IREA), are always intimately involved in these major developments. Surely, they were in 2008. Whatever problem exists was already solved 15 or more years ago. The ability to place the wall there has been affirmed by two different design companies - EMK and Norris-Designs - as far back as 2008 and as recently as 2018. EMK is still the designer now and was the designer of the 2008 plan. They have a solution. All they have to do is implement it.

That wall is inextricably linked to the road movement south in the 2008 plan from its position in the 1988 plan. It is not a randomly occurring standalone feature. It is a mitigating feature vital to the health, safety, and well-being of our neighborhood. That wall was the compromise made by the City and the previous developer, Kings Point LLC. The original mitigation, in First Capitol's 1988 plan, was a "housing bubble". The wall was required when Aurora Parkway shifted south and squeezed out the "housing bubble". The road movement south and the wall are linked together in one package deal.

I am not asking the building department to change its position and/or adopt a new one. The City's position for the past 35 years has been consistent: Aurora Parkway requires mitigation. In the 1988 plan, the City mandated "transitional low density housing to a depth of 200-500 feet" with all the surrounding neighborhoods. In the 2008 plan, the City mandated a masonry mitigating wall instead. The City has always required mitigation and it should not come as any surprise to the developer.

# STATE OF COLORADO

## Traffic & Safety

Region 1

2829 W. Howard Place

Denver, Colorado 80204



COLORADO  
Department of Transportation

Project Name: **Prairie Point**

Print Date:

Highway:

Mile Marker:

### Drainage Comments:

I have reviewed the drainage report for this site

Drainage within the development of Kings Point Filing 1 will be accommodated by storm sewer, channels, and detention basins sized such that no significant negative onsite or offsite impacts are anticipated. Offsite flows entering the property shall be allowed to enter unimpeded and are conveyed safely through the site. The onsite drainage system includes storm sewer sized for the 100-year storm event. Onsite and offsite tributary flows will be detained within two detention basins per City of Aurora requirements prior to their release into the respective drainage ways.

needs to provide details about the proposed outlet structures for the detention

Need to inspect and clean the existing 2x48" CMP located underneath SH83

I am available to meet at the site if needed

Samer 8-29-2022

### Environmental Comments:

No WQ concerns at this time.

**12/12/2022:**

#### **For ANY ground disturbance/work within CDOT ROW---**

##### **Required:**

Arch/History/Paleo:

Since this is a permit, a file search for Arch, Paleo and History is required. If the file search identifies anything, a more extensive report will be required. If nothing is identified, then the file search should be sufficient. For the file search contact:

Cultural/History File Search: <https://www.historycolorado.org/file-access> Email: [hc\\_filesearch@state.co.us](mailto:hc_filesearch@state.co.us)

Paleo File Search: Colorado University Museum of Natural History - Email: [jacob.vanveldhuizen@colorado.edu](mailto:jacob.vanveldhuizen@colorado.edu) and <https://www.dmns.org/science/earth-sciences/earth-sciences-collections/>

The ECIS will be used to support HazMat requirements.

Non-historic 4f does not apply.

If any non-historic 6f properties will be impacted or disturbed applicant shall coordinate with Veronica McCall [veronica.mccall@state.co.us](mailto:veronica.mccall@state.co.us)

Info for Applicant/Contractor:

The Permittee shall complete a stormwater management plan (SWMP) which must be prepared with good engineering, hydrologic, and pollution control practices and include at a minimum the following components:

qualified stormwater manager; spill prevention and response plan; materials handling; potential sources of pollution; implementation of control measures; site description; and site map.

In addition, the Permittee shall comply with all local/state/federal regulations and obtain all necessary permits. Permittee shall comply with CDOT's MS4 Permit. When working within a local MS4 jurisdictional boundary, the permittee shall obtain concurrence from the local MS4 that the local MS4 will provide construction stormwater oversight. The local MS4 concurrence documentation shall be retained with the SWMP.

Clear Zone: It is the responsibility of the engineer/architect who stamps the plans to ensure that: any new landscaping/trees are outside of the clear zones for any State Highway/CDOT ROW and that the new landscaping/trees do not interfere with site lines from any State Highway/CDOT ROW.

Landscape: Any new or changes to existing landscaping within CDOT ROW must be reviewed and approved by CDOT. Landscaping plans should be submitted and should include details of all proposed plant species and seed mixes/ratios.

**Traffic Comments:**

Kiene 8/26/22 - No traffic comments this submittal.

**Right of Way Comments:**

MJO - 8/15/2022 - No real concerns at this time - what is the blue line on the east side of Parker Road shown in the Plat?

It seems the primary plat is for the eastern portion of the development and the areas impacting Parker Road will occur later.

SDH - 8/16/22 - There aren't any shown currently, but will there be any ROW dedications along Parker Rd related to a possible future interchange with Aurora Pkwy?

MJO - 12/1/2022 - RESPONSE: NO ADDITIONAL RIGHT-OF-WAY IS PROPOSED AT THIS TIME. - so we assume no dedication around or near Parker Road to local and then to CDOT.

MJO - 2/3/2023 - Nothing seems to have changed with this revision - no impacts on CDOT ROW, No proposed Dedications to City with subsequent transfer to CDOT (HWY 85) and no A-Line crossings - this seem good to go from ROW/Survey perspective

**Resident Engineer Comments:**

Civil plans required for the connection at SH83. Upon that submittal, Cherry Creek will review. It is advised that a concept plan for an interchange is included to ensure infrastructure is not constructed and in conflict in the future.

**Permits Comments:**

**CDOT is currently reviewing the Notice to Proceed construction plans associated with permit #119070. That permit is issued to the City, yet the scope of work at the intersection/tie-in of Aurora Parkway to SH 83 is being constructed by the metro district. These off-site improvements are critical to this subdivision and future development within Prairie Point. CDOT has discussed and agreed with the City staff that certain notes will be added to both the site plan, plat and Master Plan as needed to address matters of maintenance responsibility of public Improvements. CDOT will need to receive a copy of those plan sheets and notes to ensure these necessary provisions are properly addressed. Whereby a Metro District has been created, and existing Contract Maintenance Agreements (for both traffic signals and RoW improvements) between the City & State now exist, it was agreed that any deferral of maintenance to the District will be by a separate agreement between the City and District (not CDOT).**

- RS 12-13-22

This subdivision clearly will need to utilize Aurora Parkway for access to SH 83. At this time, the Notice to Proceed has not been issued for construction.

The Aurora Parkway connection to SH 83 is conditionally allowed under permit 119070. That permit contains key performance indicators relative to the eventual transformation to an interchange to accommodate the traffic anticipated in the future. This is shown on the 2009 Access Management Plan (AMP) for SH 83. In that AMP document, Nichols Avenue directly north of Aurora Parkway at mm 63.46 is identified as:

*"This access would be modified with the Parker / Aurora Pkwy interchange to provide access to Aurora Pkwy or Long Ave east of the interchange"*

In short, CDOT and the City discussed at length during the rezoning of the Kings Point Property, the need to provide an alternate / secondary access to the Kraaglund Acres subdivision. It was agreed that the City of Aurora (developer) would coordinate with the City of Centennial to determine where that access easement would appear and address it at time of platting. The City of Centennial had erroneously vacated at least one of connective rights-of-way leaving only one option available. Ideally to avoid any future surprises, this planned connection should be correctly shown on the plat & site plan and an easement dedicated at this time. Please see the red-line sheet that best illustrate this omission/oversight.

This site plan & plat should both anticipate and accommodate the future interchange and not create constraints on future design alternatives. We need to ensure that Nova Drive is sufficiently spaced back from SH 83.

See red lines.

RS 08-15-22

**Bridges Comments:**

--