



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

June 28, 2024

Roger Prusse  
Prusse Development  
9162 S Lost Hill Trail  
Lone Tree, CO 80124

**Re: Second Submission Review – The Overlook at Kings Point South – Zoning Map Amendment and Master Plan**  
Application Number: **DA-1628-08**  
Case Numbers: **2023-2004-00, 2023-7003-00**

Dear Mr. Prusse.

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to review on June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2024. 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 important issues remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before July 19, 2024, to maintain your estimated Administrative Decision date. There are several repeat comments that were not addressed from the first review. If you have any questions or concerns with the review comments that require a discussion, it is recommended that a comment review meeting be scheduled with the applicable review departments. In the future, please do not hesitate to contact me to get a meeting scheduled.

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 Administrative Decision date for the master plan is tentatively set for August 28<sup>th</sup>, 2024. Please remember that all abutter notices and the site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the hearing and decision dates. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause your hearing or decision date to be postponed. It is important that you obtain an updated list of adjacent property owners from the county before the notices are sent out. Take all necessary steps to ensure an accurate list is obtained.

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,

Erik Gates  
Planner

cc: Julie Gamec, THK Associates INC.  
Cesarina Dancy, ODA  
Filed: K:\SDA\1600-1699\1628-08rev2



## *Second Submission Review*

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

- We cannot approve a master plan that does not meet current zoning density standards. The rezoning will have to occur prior to Master Plan approval, or the PAs will need to comply with R-1 zoning. [Planning]
- More detail is needed showing the Pine Drive connection both through this site and connecting to the Vistas at KPS site. [Planning]
- More detail is needed for the substation landscaping buffer. [Landscaping]
- The Antelope Creek crossing will be required in order to provide a second point of access through PA-1 and PA-2. [Civil Engineering]
- Please see the FULL comments throughout the Traffic Impact Study. [Traffic Engineering]
- Provide information that details how these shown water lines will not be dead-end water lines and show interconnection to other water mains. [Fire/Life Safety]
- The Vistas at Kings Point MUS is still pending approval. Please continue to coordinate with them to ensure consistency. [Aurora Water]
- Clarification and corrections are needed on some of the areas being counted toward PROS open space and park dedication requirements. [PROS]

### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

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

1A. No community comments were received on this review.

#### **2. Application Completeness and Clarity** (Erik Gates / 303-739-7132 / [egates@auroragov.org](mailto:egates@auroragov.org) / Comments in Teal) [Tab 3 Page 2]

2A. Make sure to remove previous review comments when resubmitting.

[Tab 10 Page 2]

2B. Repeat comment: Typo: "single-family" is misspelled on item 8.

#### **3. Zoning and Land Use Comments**

[Tab 3 Page 2]

3A. This southwestern portion of the site has been annexed under R-1 zoning. Please update the hatching.

[Tab 8 Pages 2 & 3]

3B. We cannot approve a master plan that does not meet current zoning density standards. The rezoning will have to occur prior to Master Plan approval, or the PAs will need to comply with R-1 zoning.

#### **4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues**

[Tab 8 Page 2]

4A. Vistas at KPS has updated their proposal to include a 66' ROW for Pine Dr connecting at the western edge of the site. Ensure your representation of the Pine Drive connection is consistent.

[Tab 9 Page 2]

4B. Vistas at KPS has updated their proposal to include a 66' ROW for Pine Dr connecting at the western edge of the site. Ensure your representation of the Pine Drive connection is consistent.

4C. Remember that to reach any individual lot, it shall take traveling over no more than 2 local streets after departing an arterial or collector road. It seems likely that a collector street will need to pass through the entire Overlook site in order to accommodate this requirement.

[Tab 10 Page 4]

4D. Repeat Comment: Vistas at KPS has updated their proposal to include a 66' ROW for Pine Dr connecting here. Ensure your representation of the Pine Drive connection is consistent.

[Tab 11 Page 12]

4E. Repeat Comment: You will need to organize all local streets so that each lot may be accessed by traveling over no more than two (2) local streets after departing from the grid of arterial or collector roads. There are currently



areas that clearly would require travel over 3 local streets. Converting the highlighted central roadways into a collector street would likely solve this issue.

4F. Pine Drive needs to be included as a collector as well.

[PIP Page 28]

4G. Pine Drive will be a required collector. Include its cross-section through the Overlook site as well.

[PIP Page 29]

4H. Vistas at KPS has updated their plan to include the 66' ROW for Pine Drive in roughly this location. Update your drawings to include the portion of this ROW connecting to the current Vistas proposal. (Typ. all exhibits)

## **5. Parking Issues**

5A. There were no Parking comments on this review.

## **6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues**

[Tab 10 Page 3]

6A. Repeat Comment: Include: "In the case of any conflict between these standards and UDO, the stricter will apply unless an adjustment was approved by Planning Commission" in the administration of standards and guidelines paragraph.

[Tab 10 Page 11]

6B. Repeat Comment: Where are the wood slats with concrete fencing types anticipated? A solid base fence would only be allowed for individual lot fencing if it is in the front yard and the base is no taller than 18".

6C. Repeat Comment: Fencing allowed adjacent to open tracts, trails, and parks needs to be shown here as well as these fencing types will not count. Open space fencing should be a 3-rail fence with welded wire mesh at a maximum of 4 ft tall.

[Tab 10 Page 12]

6D. Repeat Comment: Please avoid restating regulations in regard to the retaining wall railing requirement.

## **7. Signage Issues**

7A. There were no signage issues identified in this review.

## **8. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / [kbish@auroragov.org](mailto:kbish@auroragov.org) / Comments in bright teal)**

[Tab 11 Page 6]

8A. Update the single-family residential landscape table to reflect the requirement of two different rock mulches.

8B. Update the Ornamental Tree size.

[Tab 11 Page 8]

8C. Because the UDO does not require a buffer between single-family residential lots, please specify a plant quantity.

8D. Is a substation considered a street or non-street buffer? What width is anticipated for this buffer and specify the required plant quantities.

8E. While buffer reductions are typically permitted, is the intent to allow reductions for the 15' residential and substation buffers or should those remain as stated?

[Tab 11 Page 9]

8F. The Landscape Buffer Map should be updated to more closely resemble the overall map provided in Tab 3 Context Map.

8G. Add the buffer depth to the substation buffer.

[Tab 11 Page 12]

8H. The Streetscapes graphic should be updated to more closely resemble the overall map provided in Tab 3 Context Map.

8I. I don't believe a collector street would intersect a local street like this. I believe the collector sheet designation may be in the wrong location.

[Tab 11 Page 14]

8J. While cross sections have been provided for the other streets identified within this master plan, why hasn't a cross section been provided for the three-lane collector?



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

### **9. Civil Engineering** (Julie Bingham/ 303-739-7403 / [jbingham@auroragov.org](mailto:jbingham@auroragov.org) / Comments in green)

[Tab 11 Page 12]

9A. Add: Street sections provided are conceptual, and Site & Civil Plans are submitted, the street sections shall comply with the current effective Roadway Design & Construction Specifications.

9B. Aurora Parkway is a 4-lane arterial.

9C. Advisory: all street intersections shall be at a 90-degree angle.

[Tab 11 Page 13]

9D. The proposed location of the two-lane collector is not appropriate. The alternative two-lane collector is only permitted where there is no access for a minimum of 1000 feet measured from intersection flow lines. At intersections, the collector shall be as described in 4.04.2.02.1 for a minimum distance of 125 feet plus tapers as measured from flow line of the intersection street.

9E. There are no six-lane arterials in this master plan.

[PIP Page 9]

9F. Identify the street section for Pine Drive.

9G. Revise to Pine Drive is constructing within Douglas County. Douglas County may not be the entity constructing the extension outside of the City.

9H. Add: a deferral will be considered for the design and construction of Pine Drive.

[PIP Page 12]

9I. The Antelope Creek crossing will be required in order to provide a second point of access through PA-2. Identify the need for the crossing in the exhibit and the text.

[PIP Page 14]

9J. The Antelope Creek crossing will be required in order to provide a second point of access through PA-1. Identify the need for the crossing in the exhibit and the text.

[PIP Page 17]

9K. The Antelope Creek crossing will be required in order to provide a second point of access through PA-1. Identify the need for the crossing in the exhibit and the text.

9L. Typical all planning areas: remove the type to allow for flexibility since some of the potential cul de sacs would be eligible for local type 2 sections.

[PIP Page 19]

9M. The Antelope Creek crossing will be required in order to provide a second point of access through PA-2. Identify the need for the crossing in the exhibit and the text.

9N. Tab 9 shows a collector street running through PA-5. Please identify the collector in the narrative and exhibits. Please note: per section 4.04.2.02.1, single-family residential cannot front or have driveways onto a collector street unless mitigation measures identified in section 4.04.2.02.4 are provided.

[PIP Page 22]

9O. Rather than making this a separate planning area, please add it to the street section requirements for planning area 5.

[PIP Page 28]

9P. Repeat: Add: "Offsite street improvements required in order to provide a second point of access shall be completed prior to the issuance of certification of occupancies for any planning areas." This note includes the offsite streets through Vistas at Kings Point North and Prairie Point master plans.

[PIP Page 33]

9Q. Show a connection to Pine Drive for this planning area.

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

[TIS Page 1]

10A. Previous submittal comment response to "Buildout year is 2027. Why not 2030, consistent with buildout for Prairie Point (Kings Point North)" was "The buildout year remains 2027 for consistency with planned phasing of this project". However buildout year in this report is 2030, please clarify.

10B. Provide auxiliary lane evaluation utilizing SHAC criteria



10C. See full comments throughout report.

**11. Fire / Life Safety** (Richard Tenorio / 303-739-7628 / [rtenorio@auroragov.org](mailto:rtenorio@auroragov.org) / Comments in blue)

[Tab 3 Page 2]

11A. This second emergency access must be shown on all sheet and must be provided before construction to begin.

11B. Will this area to the south be annexed into the City of Aurora? If so, provide a note indicating future annexation of this area is intended as a portion of The Overlook at Kings Point South.

[Tab 8 Page 2]

11C. This second point of emergency access is not shown on any of the other drawings within this set.

11D. Identify the location for the proposed or existing fire station for this area.

[PIP Page 31]

11E. Provide information that details how these lines will not be a dead end water lines and show interconnection to other water mains.

11F. No longer connects along the south east portion of the proposed development as shown in 1st Review.

[PIP Page 32]

11G. Provide information that details how these lines will not be a dead end water lines and show interconnection to other water mains.

11H. This blue line no longer connects as shown in 1st Review?

**12. Aurora Water** (Iman Ghazali / [ighazali@auroragov.org](mailto:ighazali@auroragov.org) / Comments in red)

[MUR Page 6]

12A. The Master Utility Report for Vistas at Kings Point by Terracina Design dated January 2024 provides a sewer and water service to the west side of the Site

12B. The Vistas at Kings Point MUS is still pending approval. Please continue to coordinate with them to ensure consistency.

[MUR Page 12]

12C. Include language stating that two points of connection will be required at 1st phase of development.

[MUR Page 13]

12D. Show the COA EDN for these MUS reports (222157 and 223003, respectively).

[MUR Page 44]

12E. Please ensure that these connection points are dedicated utility corridors (no lots, etc.) for both water and sanitary.

[MUR Page 63]

12F. Junction map shows a check valve at this location; please reconcile. If two check valves are proposed, then the parallel line must be removed.

12G. Revise to "Final Development Application" or "Civil Plan".

12H. Need to verify if this is a utility corridor.

[MUR Page 65]

12I. Advisory: acute angle; must be revised at civil plan or in this plan.

12J. With this outlet split, a length of pipe can be eliminated (TYP).

12K. KPN MUS shows the connection stub at this location; please reconcile or confirm that the proposed tie in location is a utility corridor.

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

13A. Comments have not yet been received from Forestry. Your case manager will pass any Forestry comments along once they are complete.

**14. PROS** (Adison Petti / [apetti@auroragov.org](mailto:apetti@auroragov.org) / Comments in mauve)

[Tab 8 Page 2]

14A. Update these numbers in the Land Use date table to reflect revisions made based on PROS comments provided in Tab 9.

14B. PA-8 does not qualify for community park land dedication credit. It should be identified and counted as open



space instead.

- 14C. This should not be part of the neighborhood park planning area because it will function as open space.
  - 14D. This detention pond does not appear to be represented on the map in Tab 9. Is it still proposed? If so, be sure that the area occupied by the pond is excluded from the PA-9 acreage proposed for open space credit in Form J.
- [Tab 9 Page 2]
- 14E. Reduce the geographic extent of PA-7 to reflect the actual area expected to be improved for neighborhood park purposes. The site could be as small as 3 acres in size as long as the park offers the required programmatic elements described in Section 6.10 of the PROS manual. The rest of the area should be identified as open space and counted as such, if needed for satisfying land dedication requirements.
  - 14F. The line symbology on this plan is confusing. Planning areas are typically delineated using a solid line while features such as trails are shown with a dashed line.
  - 14G. Is this "Primary Amenity" intended to be the location of a clubhouse and pool facility operated by the HOA or metro district? If so, the area associated with those improvements must be excluded from the acreage that is eligible for land dedication credit in the park. Please clarify in Form J, if applicable.
  - 14H. Is there a hierarchy to the trails? What design standards will apply? If this is not defined elsewhere in the Master Plan, please add.

[Tab 9 Page 3]

- 14I. The Library and Recreation Services signature space is not needed. Please remove.
- 14J. Change PA-8 to open space credit as this acreage does not qualify as community park land.
- 14K. For each item in the Parks credit table, clarify in column E who will be responsible for ownership and maintenance of the park and open space areas. Will it be the metro district?
- 14L. Delete PA-10 from Form J if it is not needed to help meet the required open space land dedication.
- 14M. Expand the description to commit to the provision of required neighborhood park programmatic elements.
- 14N. Update the acreage required/provided numbers based on revisions made elsewhere to this form.
- 14O. The acreage of PA-8 in conjunction with the non-floodplain acreage in PA-9 is enough to satisfy the overall open space land dedication requirement for the development. Therefore, you could divide PA-9 into two separate planning areas - one for the floodplain and the other for the area not impacted by it. The latter could be included in Form J without having to address the 50% of floodplain. Also, the former could be absorbed into PA-10 as inclusive of all acreage devoted to floodplain, stormwater management, and detention ponds.

**15. Public Art** (Roberta Bloom / 303-739-6747 / [rbloom@auroragov.org](mailto:rbloom@auroragov.org))

- 15A. The budget numbers in the public art plan now seem to be correct. We look forward to seeing the plans updated with your first preliminary plat, as stated.

**16. Xcel Energy** (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / [donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto:donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com))

- 16A. There were no more comments from Xcel Energy on this review.

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

- 17A. No more comments were received from Mile High Flood District on this review.

**18. Douglas County** (Curtis J. Weitkunat / 303-660-7460 / [cweitkunat@douglas.co.us](mailto:cweitkunat@douglas.co.us))

- 18A. No more comments were received from Douglas County on this review.