

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



August 30, 2023

Tim Sanford
Kings Point Investment, LLLP
2707 Willamette Lane
Greenwood Village, CO 80121

Re: Second Submission Review – Vistas at Kings Point South – Master Plan
Application Number: **DA-1628-09**
Case Numbers: **2023-7004-00**

Dear Mr. Sanford:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on August 8th, 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.

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 September 20th, 2023.

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 is set for November 8th, 2023. Please remember that all abutter notices and the site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the decision date. These notifications are your responsibility, and the lack of proper notification will cause your administrative 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.

Sincerely,

Erik Gates
Planner

cc: Mike Weiher, Terracina Design.
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\1600-1699\1628-09rev2



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- It appears that the residential density proposed in the future R-2 region still exceeds the maximum density of 5 DUs per acre. [Planning]
- Crusher fines are not an option for mulch within curbside landscaping. [Landscaping]
- A typical section for Pine Drive in conformance with SEATS needs to be shown in the master plan. [Civil Engineering]
- Use daily traffic counts on Inspiration Dr to develop volumes for 4-hour and 8-hour Warrant evaluation, and provide justification for different distribution on E-470 north with/without the Pine Drive extension. [Traffic Engineering]
- Provide a narrative explaining how the Vistas sanitary flow discharge is also in conformance with the Prairie Point proposed pipe sizing and MUS. [Aurora Water]
- Please see the comment letter from Douglas County School District.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. There were no more community comments on this review cycle.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

2A. There were no Completeness or Clarity comments on this review.

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

[Tab 3 Page 3]

3A. Show the expected R-1 and R-2 zone district boundaries since a rezone is not anticipated to be pursued until the site plan submittals.

[Tab 8 Page 3]

3B. The maximum density proposed in the R-2 district is still above the code required 5 DUs/acre at 9.8 DUs/acre here.

[Tab 8 Page 4]

3C. The maximum percentage of small lots is only allowed to be 50% in the R-2 zone district. Maximum percentage is 25% in the R-1 district. Make this distinction in the table or specify that small lots will only be in the R-2 district area. It is understood that the exact location and breakdown of small lots may shift at the time of site plan, but the master plan cannot be approved if any potential code conflict is indicated.

4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues

[Tab 3 Page 3]

4A. Pine Drive is ultimately a requirement of the Southeast Area Transportation Study (SEATS). It is also identified as a 4-lane minor arterial connecting all the way to Aurora Parkway. It should be identified here.

[Tab 4 Page 5]

4B. Please continue to communicate with the owners of Prairie Point for the relocation of Aurora Parkway in their master plan. A MP amendment submission with a proposed alignment matching what is shown for Aurora Parkway in this proposal will be needed from the Prairie Point applicant before we can approve this master plan. Alternatively, the alignment in this submission can be shown to match what is already approved in the Prairie Point master plan document.

[Tab 6 Page 4]

4C. The Pine Drive connection to Aurora Parkway is ultimately a requirement of SEATS. While its exact location may not be known at this time, it will need to be shown in the master plan and it will still be your responsibility to set aside space for this 4-lane arterial in the future site plan submittals. The general alignment needs to be shown in the master plan and should be consistently identified as a public improvement for the planning areas it crosses.



5. Parking Issues

5A. There were no parking issues identified in this review.

6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

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

7. Signage Issues

7A. There were no signage issues on this review.

8. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)

[Tab 11 Page 2]

8A. Crusher fines is not an option for mulch within curbside landscapes. If a specific use is intended, then explain that here.

9. Transportation Planning (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7340 / tworker@auroragov.org / Comments in light blue)

9A. There were no transportation planning comments on this review cycle.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

10. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

[Tab 8 Page 5]

10A. The comment response indicated that Pine Drive would be included on the master plan. Please show how it will connect on all applicable sheets.

[PIP Page 5]

10B. Repeat: Aurora Parkway is an obligation of this property. It is understood that coordination is ongoing with adjacent landowners. Identify the limits of the obligation for this property in the PIP.

[PIP Page 17]

10C. Remove the FEMA maps from the PIP, they are not necessary.

[PIP Page 19]

10D. Remove this title from this sheet.

[PIP Page 21]

10E. Repeat: Identify Aurora Parkway as an obligation of this property. Identify the extents required. (Typical all exhibits).

10F. The comment response indicated that Pine Drive would be shown on the master plan. Please identify it on the exhibits and the narrative. Provide a typical section in conformance with SEATS.

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

[TIS Page 1]

11A. Use daily traffic counts on Inspiration Dr to develop volumes for 4-hour and 8-hour Warrant evaluation.

11B. Provide justification for different distribution on E-470 north with/without the Pine Drive extension.

11C. See comments throughout report.

[TIS Page 12]

11D. Completed by what year?

[TIS Page 14]

11E. Verify, a portion of the WB traffic is destined to/from Parker Road north and wouldn't utilize the Pine Dr extension.

In addition, a portion of the EB traffic is destined to/from E-470 north and wouldn't utilize the Pine Dr extension.

11F. Use daily traffic counts on Inspiration Dr to develop volumes for 4-hour and 8-hour Warrant evaluation.

[TIS Page 41]

11G. Provide justification for difference with Pine Drive Extension.



[TIS Page 42]

11H. Provide justification for difference without Pine Drive Extension.

[TIS Page 280]

11I. Use daily traffic counts on Inspiration Dr to develop volumes for 4-hour and 8-hour Warrant evaluation.

12. Fire / Life Safety (Steve Kirchner / 303-739-7489 / stkirchn@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

[Tab 8 Page 6]

12A. Since fire stations are no longer being considered, please remove this note.

13. Aurora Water (Nina Khanzadeh / 720-859-4365 / rkhanzad@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

[PIP Page 1]

13A. Is this Aurora Pkwy- Clarify

[MUR Page 5]

13B. Prairie Point MUS shows a 16-inch water line in Aurora Pkwy- Clarify.

[MUR Page 6]

13C. Reference the most up to date standards, 2023.

13D. Should be 14-inch.

13E. Should say “not allowed”.

13F. Should say “Water pipe material”.

[MUR Page 8]

13G. Provide a narrative explaining how the Vistas sanitary flow discharge is also in conformance with the Prairie Point proposed pipe sizing and MUS.

[MUR Page 9]

13H. Indicate that you included the 2.77 people per unit standard here.

[MUR Page 10]

13I. Reference the most up to date MUS amendment, approved in January 2023.

13J. Use the most up to date standards.

[MUR Page 14]

13K. Include signature block on all water and sanitary exhibits for Aurora Water and Life Safety to sign. Life Safety does not have to sign sanitary exhibits.

13L. Very steep conditions- during grading need to ensure not too deep sewers.

[MUR Page 15]

13M. Move closer to original boundary.

13N. Include signature block on all water and sanitary exhibits for Aurora Water and Life Safety to sign. Life Safety does not have to sign sanitary exhibits.

[MUR Page 17]

13O. Send live documents and modeling files via email to ighazali@auroragov.org.

[MUR Page 22]

13P. What is spike from? Please respond in comment responses.

[MUR Page 27]

13Q. Missing circular worksheet for design point 2.

[MUR Page 36]

13R. Need to utilize the most recent MUS amendment dated in January 2023.

14. Forestry (Rebecca Lamphear / 303-739-7177 / rlamphea@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

14A. There were no more comments from Forestry on this review.

15. PROS (Curtis Bish / 303-739-7131 / cbish@auroragov.org / Comments in mauve)

15A. Comments from PROS are forthcoming. Please reach out to the reviewer directly for comments.

16. Public Art (Roberta Bloom / 303-739-6747 / rbloom@auroragov.org)

16A. There were no more comments from Public Art on this review.

**17. Xcel Energy (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)**

17A. PSCo/Xcel Energy has no additional comments to what was already conveyed. Previous comments are included for reference.

[Previous Comments]

17B. To ensure that adequate utility easements are available within this development, PSCo requests that the following language or plat note be placed on the preliminary and final plats for the subdivision:
“Six-foot (6’) wide utility easements are hereby dedicated on private property adjacent to the front lot lines and eight-foot (8’) on the rear lot lines of each lot in the subdivision or platted area identified as single-family lots. Ten-foot (10’) wide utility easements are hereby dedicated on private property adjacent to all public streets, and around the perimeter of each multi-family lot in the subdivision or platted area including tracts, parcels and/or open space areas. These easements are dedicated to the City of Aurora for the benefit of the applicable utility providers for the installation, maintenance, and replacement of electric, gas, television, cable, and telecommunications facilities. Utility easements shall also be granted within any access easements and private streets in the subdivision. Permanent structures, improvements, objects, buildings, wells, water meters and other objects that may interfere with the utility facilities or use thereof (Interfering Objects) shall not be permitted within said utility easements and the utility providers, as grantees, may remove any Interfering Objects at no cost to such grantees, including, without limitation, vegetation. Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCo) and its successors reserve the right to require additional easements and to require the property owner to grant PSCo an easement on its standard form.”

17C. PSCo also requests that all utility easements be depicted graphically on the preliminary and final plats. While these easements should accommodate the majority of utilities to be installed in the subdivision, some additional easements may be required as planning and building progresses.

17D. In addition, 31-23-214 (3), C.R.S., requires the subdivider, at the time of subdivision platting, to provide for major utility facilities such as electric substation sites, gas or electric transmission line easements and gas regulator/meter station sites as deemed necessary by PSCo. While this provision will not be required on every plat, when necessary, PSCo will work with the subdivider to identify appropriate locations. This statute also requires the subdivider to submit a letter of agreement to the municipal/county commission that adequate provision of electrical and/or gas service has been provided to the subdivisions.

17E. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas 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. For additional easements that may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities, the Designer must contact a Right-of-Way and Permits Agent

18. Mile High Flood District (Laura Hinds / 303-455-6277 / submittals@mhfd.org)

18A. No more comments were received from MHFD on this review.

19. Douglas County School District (Shavon Caldwell / 303-387-0417 / scaldwell2@dcsdk12.org)

19A. A total of 163 students are expected from this development requiring a total land dedication requirement of 3.866-acres. Since the initially estimated land dedication does not meet DCSD’s minimum school site size requirement for elementary schools (12 acres), DCSD would request cash-in-lieu of land dedication.

19B. Alternatively, DCSD would accept dedication of a school site meeting DCSD’s minimum elementary school site size requirement. DCSD would ask that dedication be by agreement as outlined in Section 4.3.18.S.2 of the Aurora UDO and that the site meet all location standards outlined in Section 4.3.18.A.1 of the Aurora UDO and those DCSD school design criteria and development standards listed on the DCSD Development Standards webpage.

19C. If dedication of a school site by agreement is proposed, DCSD would ask that a minimum of 60 days be provided to the district to fully review and accept the site prior to final plat approval.

19D. It is unclear to DCSD if it is the intent of the Kings Point South and Vistas at Kings Point South applicants to dedicate adjacent/adjoining properties to achieve a single, cohesive school site. If this is the case, DCSD would ask that in addition to the previously mentioned site dedication requests, that the timing of site dedication aligns with the build out and anticipated student generation of the two developments.

19E. Pending confirmation of applicable use restrictions in the CITY of Aurora zoning ordinance, DCSD would



consider dedication of land to be used for a future alternative educations or support facility.

Finally, pending confirmation of applicable use restrictions in the City of Aurora zoning ordinance, DCSD would consider dedication of land to be used for a future alternative educational or support facility. If dedication of a site for an alternative educational or support facility is proposed, DCSD would ask that a minimum of 60 days be provided to the district to fully review and accept the site prior to final plat approval.

Assuming the applicant agrees with this request for land dedication or cash-in-lieu of dedication, DCSD has no objection to approval of this application.

Shavon Caldwell, Planning Manager

DCSD Planning & Construction

scaldwell2@dcsdk12.org

desk: 303.387.0417

mobile: 720.428.1170