



May 10, 2024

City of Aurora, Planning Department
15151 E. Alameda Parkway
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: Trails at Overland Ranch 1 – Site Plan and Plat
Application Number: DA-1692-04

Dear Erik Gates,

Thank you for taking the time to discuss our plans for the Trails at Overland Ranch Site Plan application. Valuable feedback was given by City Staff and adjustments have been made. We have reviewed the comments provided March 13, 2024 and have responded in the following pages.

Please feel free to contact me directly should you have any other comments, questions and/or special requests for additional information. We look forward to working with you to make this project a success.

Sincerely,
Norris Design

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Samantha Pollmiller', written over a light gray circular stamp.

Samantha Pollmiller
Principal



Third Submission Review
PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

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

Response: Noted, thank you.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

2A. Completeness and Clarity of the application comments have been resolved.

Response: Noted, thank you.

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

3A. There were no more zoning or land use comments on this review.

Response: Noted. Thank you.

4. Parking Comments

4A. There were no more parking comments on this review.

Response: Noted. Thank you.

5. Signage & Fencing Comments

Site Plan

Sheet 1

5A. Specify that the maximum residential signage area is per sign.

Response: Max signage updated to be per sign.

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

Site Plan

Sheet 55

6A. Update the key lot typical descriptions to reflect the review comments provided.

Response: Lot typical descriptions have been updated per comments provided.

6B. Is the area indicated to be open space tract "O" supposed to be gray?

Response: Tract O has been changed to gray.

Sheet 58

6C. What is the identified linework in blue?

Response: Utility Easement per civil. Linework has been adjusted to match between landscape and civil, and trees have been removed from easement.

6D. Why was the curbside landscape narrowed by two feet? It does not appear that this section of the E. Mineral Avenue meets the required street cross section.



Response: The sidewalk was expanded from 6' to 8' to match the sidewalk on the south side of E Mineral Avenue.

6E. Please turn off the identified dashed outline on all landscape sheets.

Response: Dashed lines have been turned off in landscape areas.

6F. The open space line type symbology in the legend and on the plan, do not match.

Response: Linetypes have been adjusted to match between the legend and the plan.

Sheet 59

6G. Add a material call out to the trail where indicated on the sheet.

Response: Callout has been added as indicated.

Sheet 69 & 74

6H. Correct the labels pointing to nothing.

Response: Labels have been corrected.

6I. Add plant labels where indicated.

Response: Plant labels have been added.

6J. There are curbside areas that are deficient in shrubs. Please address.

Response: Appropriate amount of shrubs have been to curbside areas and chart has been updated to reflect the change.

Sheet 75

6K. Why two fences types?

Response: Removed fence type that was not needed.

Sheet 79

6L. Where is the Faux fence used on the site/landscape plan?

Response: Callout was corrected to reference the correct detail.

8. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / pcturner@auroragov.org)

8A. There were no more addressing comments on this review.

Response: Noted. Thank you.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

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

Site Plan

Sheet 2



9A. Thank you for identifying the mitigation measures in the comment response. Please provide a note on this sheet identifying which lots will require the mitigation measures and the two measures selected.

Response: Mitigation measures added to the tracking sheet.

Sheet 5

9B. The meeting in early December indicated that the sidewalk would be private but still within 30' of the ROW, inclusive of the sidewalk. Please revise all walks to meet this requirement.

Response: Public walk alignment revised to stay within 30' of row. Easement provided.

Sheet 13

9C. Please revise to an access easement on the plat.

Response: Revised.

Sheet 50

9D. As indicated in the early December meeting, the walk along S Monaghan Rd should only meander a maximum of 30' outside of the ROW inclusive of the sidewalk width. Please also remove the sidewalk from the section within the ROW for clarity since no portion of sidewalk, public or private is proposed in the ROW.

Response: Public walk alignment revised to stay within 30' of row. Easement provided.

9E. Management staff is discussing the section proposed for County Line Rd. and the sidewalk requirement will be provided via email as soon as a determination is made about whether the bike lane will remain on the street or be combined with the sidewalk.

Response: Noted, section updated per staff's latest direction.

10. Traffic Engineering (Carl Harline / 303-739-7584 / charline@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

Site Plan Comments

Sheet 4

10A. Show and label proposed mail kiosk locations.

Note – 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.

Response: Mail kiosks added and labeled. Notes added to site plan.



Sheet 10

10B. No raised intersections, per previous comment. Please remove where they are called out in future submittals.

Response: Prior comments requested to remove a specific intersection and add a raised intersection detail for the remaining raised intersections. Per latest comments all raised intersections have been removed.

Sheet 18 & 19

10C. Call out all signs, typical all sheets.

Response: Signed callouts added.

Sheet 20

10D. Show sight triangles, as well as on landscape plan, per TE-13.

Response: Sight triangles added.

Sheet 22

10E. N Armory St and E Elmhurst Place is a local/local intersection, remove crosswalk markings, per previous comment. Match Site Plan sheets to these Sign/Striping sheets.

Response: This is a collector/local intersection. Crosswalks remain on collector street for consistency within the subdivision.

Sheet 23

10F. Remove crosswalk markings, per previous comment.

Response: This is a collector intersection on 3 legs. Removed crosswalk from eastern local leg of intersection.

Sheet 27

10G. Remove raised intersections typical all instances where they are called out, per previous comment.

Response: Prior comments requested to remove a specific intersection and add a raised intersection detail for the remaining raised intersections. Per latest comments all raised intersections have been removed.

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

Site Plan Comments

Sheet 35

11A. Provide calculation for dead-end fire hydrant. See note provided.

Response: PSI calculation provided.

11B. Check with Aurora Water if 90 degree bend on a fire hydrant lateral is acceptable.

Response: Confirmed.

12. Aurora Water Comments (Iman Ghazali / 303-883-2060 / ighazali@auroragov.org / Comments in red)



Sheet 1

12A. The site plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.

Response: Noted.

Sheet 35

12B. Show storm as connecting.

Response: Revised to show storm connecting through inlet.

Sheet 41

12C. Maintenance access paths shall be provided to these manholes.

Response: Maintenance access added to these manholes.

Sheet 44

12D. Ensure maintenance access paths to public culverts, storm manholes and outlet structures are able to allow maintenance vehicles to traverse them (12 ft wide, 10% max longitudinal slopes etc per the SDDTC) (Typical).

Response: Maintenance access added to culverts.

Sheet 47

12E. Sanitary easement required where indicated.

Response: 50' sanitary easement added.

Sheet 58

12F. Please ensure that there are no trees planted within 3 ft of a water meter pit. Additionally, it is preferred that the same clearance is provided to sanitary service lines to ensure the longevity and ease of maintenance of those lines (Typical).

Response: No trees are within 3' of a water meter pit and clearance is given to other sanitary service lines whenever possible.

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

Site Plan Comments

Sheet 40

13A. It is preferred that trails which provide enhanced connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists throughout Trails at Overland Ranch be ADA compliant (not exceeding 5% longitudinal grade). We acknowledge that the existing topography makes it challenging to meet that standard everywhere, but PROS still encourages that the grading plan be adjusted accordingly as much as practical through open space areas that aren't technically receiving land dedication credit.

Response: Trails adjacent ponds and channel adjusted where practical with existing grades. Practical efforts to ensure ada and maintenance access requirements are both achieved.

Sheet 41

13B. This neighborhood connection is steep.

Response: Trail re-aligned and grades improved.

13C. It is preferred that trails which provide enhanced connectivity for pedestrians and bicyclists throughout Trails at Overland Ranch be ADA compliant. We acknowledge that the existing



topography makes it challenging to meet that standard everywhere, but PROS still encourages that the grading plan be adjusted accordingly as much as practical through open space areas that aren't technically receiving land dedication credit.

Response: Trails adjacent ponds and channel adjusted where practical with existing grades. Practical efforts to ensure ada and maintenance access requirements are both achieved.

Sheet 42

13D. The steep grade of these trails are problematic, particularly since they are located within a planning area that is provided to satisfy open space land dedication requirements.

Response: The slopes of these walks have been reduced to allow enhanced pedestrian access. Trail west of channel re-aligned to improve this connectivity.

Sheet 43

13E. It doesn't appear that the grading includes the shoulders depicted in the detail on sheet 50?

Response: Grading revised to include 2' shoulder per the details on sheet 50. Shoulders graded where steeper slopes exist. Will also confirm 2' shoulders with construction documents.

Sheet 50

13F. These details indicate the provision of shoulders on both sides of the trails, but it doesn't appear shoulders are incorporated on the grading plan sheets.

Response: Grading revised to include 2' shoulder per the details on sheet 50. Shoulders graded where steeper slopes exist. Will also confirm 2' shoulders with construction documents.

14. Land Development Review (Roger Nelson / 720-587-2657 / ronelson@auroragov.org)

Plat General Comments

14A. There are some Lots in Block 4 that need to be revised to be sequential with the rest of the Lots in the Block.

Response: Lot numbering updated.

14B. There are several pages that show these Lots to be updated.

Response: Lot numbering updated.

14C. On some of the pages there are references to a Sidewalk easement along Monaghan Road even though the same area on the Site Plan is showing an Access easement in the same area. Please check with the Aurora Engineering Dept. to see if they will be maintaining these sidewalks in these configurations. Also, there are 12' Gravel Maintenance Access Roads (Site Plan) in Tract B that is named as a sidewalk easement on the Plat.

Response: Monaghan rd easement is now referened as a sidewalk easement. The maintenance access removes the work sidewalk for clarity.

14D. There are several pages that show these Lots to be updated.

Response: Lot numbering updated.

14E. On the Site Plan: there is an Advisory Comment on all pages stating: Change the R.O.W. lines and Lot lines to be solid continuous (Typ.) This is a standard for Site Plans in the Checklist.



Response: Line types updated.

14F. Numerous minor comments. See the full redline comments throughout the subdivision plat and site plan.

Response: Noted.

Plat Page 1

14G. Advisory Comment - be aware that this space in the top righthand corner may not be large enough for the County Recorders info. The County may reject this plat because of the space needed.

Response: Noted.

14G. Advisory Comment - be aware that this space in the top righthand corner may not be large enough for the County Recorders info. The County may reject this plat because of the space needed.

Response: Noted.

14H. (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.)

Response: Noted.

14I. (Advisory Comment) Send in the Certificate of Taxes Due 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.)

Response: Noted.

14J. (Advisory Comment) Be advised – sometimes the margins or scale factor may not match the County or City standards as stated in the Subdivision Plat Checklist. If any of these factors are misaligned or scale does not match the drawing information, then this may cause the plat to be sent back and corrected and thus adding time to your submittal. And in turn, you may need to update the Title Commitment to bring it within the 30-day time limit. Please check these items before sending the plat in for recording.

Response: Noted.

15. Revenue (Melody Oestmann / 303-739-7244 / moestman@auroragov.org)

15A. Continued Advisory Comment: Storm Drainage Development fees due: 171-acres x \$1,242 = \$212,382.

Response: Noted. All fees will be paid prior to recordation.



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

16A. PSCo acknowledges the comment response and requested changes made to the plat. No resubmittals are necessary.

Response: Noted.

17. Arapahoe County Public Works and Development Engineering (Sue Liu / 720-874-6500 / sliu@arapahoegov.com)

17A. As shown, the overflow spillways for Ponds B and C are directed flow onto the State Land Board property. This constitutes a change in characteristic of flow and easements should be obtained from the northern property.

- Coordinate with State Land Board for any stabilization required for the outfalls of the ponds.

Response: Noted. Owner received a letter from the State land board May 6th approving our grading plans and intention to discharge onto the property. This includes coordination & instructions for temporary construction access permits.

17B. With this new development, the maintenance of County Line Road in this area should be memorialized, visa-vie either a three-party IGA with City of Aurora/Arapahoe County/Albert County or by separate IGA between City of Aurora and Arapahoe County. Please contact Arapahoe County Transportation Division @ 720-874-6500 or Road & Bridge Division @ 720-874-7623 for the IGA.

Response: Noted. A meeting to discuss this segment was held May 2, 2024. It is our understanding that the City has agreed to take the lead on drafting the IGA and circulating drafts to Arapahoe & Elbert counties when available.