

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



December 31, 2020

Thomas Gissen
Meritage Homes
8400 Crescent Pkwy, Ste 200
Greenwood Village, CO 80111

Re: Second Submission Review – Murphy Creek PA 16 & 20 – Site Plan w/ Adjustments, Plat
Application Number: **DA-1250-48**
Case Numbers: **2020-4020-00**

Dear Mr. Gissen:

Thank you for your initial submission, which we started to process on Wednesday, December 9, 2020. 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 a technical submission after the Planning Commission hearing set for January 13, 2021. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before Monday, January 18, 2021.

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) 739-7184 or hlambo@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Heather Lamboy, Planning Supervisor
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Karen Henry, Henry Design Group
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\1250-48rev2



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Please address the technical comments below.
Response: All comments have been addressed.
- License agreements are needed; please remember that a license agreement takes approximately 6-8 weeks to process and must be complete prior to recordation of Site Plan mylars.
Response: Comment acknowledged.
- Please provide more detailed elevations and the Murphy Creek Design Review Board approval letter.
Response: Detailed elevations in color and black and white have been added. Regarding the approval letter, please see comment response below (2C.)
- Please provide a material/sample exhibit.
Response: An exhibit for colors and materials has been added.

Traffic comments will be sent under separate cover.

Response: No traffic comments were received.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

- 1A. No comments were received from the public.

Response: Comment acknowledged.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

- 2A. *Repeat comment:* No adjacent property owner information was uploaded to the case file. Please upload this information so we can refer the case out for their review.

Response: Adjacent owner information will be uploaded.

- 2B. *Repeat comment:* Please get an updated list of neighborhood associations and request that Scott Campbell upload these into the AMANDA system for referral purposes.

Response: List of neighborhood associations was acquired from Scott Campbell in advance of the Planning Commission hearing. As such, the HOAs were notified of the hearing. No further action is necessary.

- 2C. Murphy Creek Design Review approval letter must be received prior to final approval. As part of the Planning Commission report, a condition of approval will be recommended that addresses this issue.

Response: A Master Declarant Approval Letter was uploaded on 9/22/2020 as part of the 1st Site Plan submission. It is titled 'Meritage Homes Architectural Approval'. In essence, the letter exempts the Builder (Meritage) from having to go through the DRC Approval process. An email was sent to the city on January 13, 2021, further explaining why the request for DRC Approval as a Condition of Approval for the Site plan is not required:

'Under Article V, Section 13(b) of the Master Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions for Murphy Creek (attached), as long as a builder has received design approval from the Master Declarant, the builder is exempt from the other provisions of Article V. Murphy Creek Development, Inc., the Master Declarant, issued such approval in its letter of September 21, 2020 (attached). Accordingly, Meritage is not required under the governing CCRs to obtain approval from the Murphy Creek Architectural Review Committee.'

- 2D. *Repeat comment:* Please provide a material/sample exhibit.

Response: The exhibit is included in this submittal.

3. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

- 3A. Please remember that there are very specific standards related to architecture for Single Family Detached residential homes. Please refer to Section 2.2.1 of the Murphy Creek Development Standards. Included



are minimum floor area, porch design, masonry requirements, roof shapes/materials, and more. Please provide more detailed house models and elevations. You will likely need that for the Murphy Creek DRB. They can be provided with the Murphy Creek DRB approval letter.

Response: Colored and black & white elevations have been added, together with an exhibit for colors and materials. A chart has been provided to show how architecture meets all GDP and UDO standards.

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

Sheet L-1 Landscape Plan

4A. If these are to remain on the landscape plan, add them to the legend a block numbers.

Response: Legend has been changed to reflect block numbers.

4B. These two hatches are tough to decipher from one another on the plan, plus it makes seeing the shrubs in the beds more difficult. If possible, just handle the rock mulches as a note on the plan and remove the hatching all together. 1.5" in to be used in "X" areas and 2"-4" cobble in "Y" areas.

Response: The hatch for rock mulch in planting beds has been removed and replaced by a note on Sheet 21. The hatch for 2"-4" rock cobble will remain in order to easily be located on the plans.

4C. No matchline information along here.

Response: Matchline information is now provided.

Sheet L-2 Landscape Plan

4D. Add these two hatches to the legend.

Response: The hatch types have been added.

4E. Some plant call-outs are missing. Make sure these plants are 26" or less in height from the roadway surface within the sight distance triangles.

Response: The call-outs have been added and the plants are spreading ground cover that stays below 26".

Sheet L-4 Landscape Plan

4F. No matchline information.

Response: Matchline information is now provided.

4G. The residential yard requirements should be shown. Do not recite the code as the inspectors only inspect to what is proposed for actual front yard landscaping. They can't figure out in the field what the front yard lot size is and determine what should have been included. Refer to the examples e-mailed under separate cover.

Response: The landscape lot typicals have been revised per discussions and the supplied examples.

4H. A few plants have been flagged as being potentially too tall within the sight distance triangles.

Response: The plants have been replaced with a low growing variety of the species.

Sheet L-5 Landscape Plan

4I. Is there no fencing being provided between the rear lots?

Response: Fencing is optional and by homeowner.

5. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / pturner@auroragov.org)

5A. *Repeat comment:* Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for addressing and other GIS mapping purposes. Include the parcel, street line, easement and building footprint layers at a minimum. Please ensure that the digital file provided in a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Please contact me if you need additional information about this digital file.

Response: Acknowledged. CAD will be provided after CDs become closer to approval to ensure that no changes to the linework will occur due to engineering comments.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

6. Civil Engineering (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / KTanabe@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

6A. The Site Plan will not be approved until the Preliminary Drainage Report/Letter is approved by Public Works.



- Response: Understood**
- 6B. Please remove AutoCad SHX text items in the comment section. Please flatten to reduce the select-ability of the items.
Response: PDF has been flattened to remove AutoCad SHX text.
- 6C. This needs to be a single filing or two separate drainage reports are required. [Comment from Heather: This should be fixed with the renaming of the plans as redlined]
Response: Per discussion with city, Site plan will be titled as "Planning Areas 16 & 20" Preliminary Drainage Report has been updated accordingly
- 6D. When will a subdivision plat be submitted?
Response: Subdivision Plat has been submitted
- 6E. There will not be crosswalks provided across Jewell until a traffic signal is installed.
Response: Crosswalks across East Jewell Avenue have been removed from plan.
- 6F. A license agreement is required for the island and is required to be recorded prior to the approval of the site plan.
Response: Understood
- 6G. Per previous comment, dimension the length of the transition, typical. (Sheets 4 & 5)
Response: Dimension String has been added for all transitions.
- 6H. Show and label proposed retaining walls. Indicate material type and max height or height range.
Response: Retaining wall has been added added. Wall max heights are shown in the section.
- 6I. On the detention pond, label the slope, not the max slope (Sheets 6 & 7)
Response: Comment addressed
- 6J. Label the slope in the pond bottom, don't just add a 2% min. note. (Sheets 6 & 7)
Response: Comment addressed
- 6K. The pond is private and will be privately maintained. (Sheets 6 & 7)
Response: Note added
- 6L. Include the FIRM Panel and effective date (Sheet 7).
Response: Panel number and date has been added to the floodplain delineation.
- 6M. This is not a typical street profile. A steeper slope should be provided across the "eyebrow" to ensure positive drainage (Sheet 7).
Response: Grading has been revised to have a steeper slope
- 6N. For all non-paved areas, 2% slope.
Response: Grading has been updated to ensure 2% min slope on non paved areas

7. Traffic Engineering (Carlie Campuzano / 303-739-7309 / ccampuza@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

Traffic Letter

- 7A. No comments were received as of the date of this letter and will be sent under separate cover.
Response: Acknowledged.

Site Plan

- 7B. No comments were received as of the date of this letter and will be sent under separate cover.
Response: Acknowledged.

8. Fire / Life Safety (John VanEssen / 303-739-7489 / jvanesse@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Sheet 3

- 8A. Please relabel the Gating Detail "Fire Lane" Gate Detail.
Response: Comment Addressed

Sheet 5

- 8B. Please add the Sidewalks and Curb and Gutter into the 6" PCC standards to meet the imposed weight of 85K (along the entire Fire Lane) for the Fire Apparatuses.
Response: Comment Addressed

Sheet 8 & 9

- 8C. Please label the 23' Manual Swinging Gate with Knox Lock on Utility Plans.
Response: Comment Addressed



8D. Please label the 23' Fire Lane Easement on Utility Plans.

Response: Comment Addressed

9. Aurora Water (Daniel Pershing / 303-739-7646 / ddpershi@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

Sheet 8

9A. This portion of the waterline is not covered by easement or ROW dedication. I suggest dedicate separate easements. One 23' easement for firelane and one 16' easement for the utility.

Response: Easement added

Sheet 9

9B. Please revise text issues, typ.

Response: Comment addressed

9C. This portion of waterline is not covered by the 23' easement as it is outside of the proposed fire lane and utility easement dedication.

Response: Comment addressed

10. PROS (Michelle Teller / 303-739-7437 / mteller@auroragov.org / Comments in mauve)

10A. Call out the shortest distance from edge of path to retaining wall. PROS needs to retain at least a 5' setback from the edge of the wall to the edge of the path.

Response: shortest width dimension has been added.

10B. Note the outlet structure will need to be covered by the license agreement.

Response: Understood

10C. In previous discussions, we noted that the flows above 5 years will be directed to existing swales on the golf course property to ensure direction into the creek. Please identify those for context.

Response: The water quality ponds and outlet structures are sized for the 100 year event and flow are only released to the golf course if the ponds become completely clogged. Drainage arrows have been added to the off site areas between the site and the golf course to show drainage patterns.

Real Property (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / mbrooks@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

Cover Sheet

10D. Change text type, some information is lost throughout the Site Plan.

Response: Comment addressed

Sheet 2

10E. Change text type, some information is lost throughout the Site Plan.

Response: Comment addressed

Sheet 3

10F. Change text type, some information is lost throughout the Site Plan.

Response: Comment addressed

10G. A license agreement is needed for the gates in the right-of-way.

Response: Comment acknowledged.

Sheet 4

10H. Change text type, some information is lost throughout the Site Plan.

Response: Comment addressed

10I. Add the bearings, distances and curve data to all the Lots, Tracts and R.O.W. to match the plat information.

Response: Comment addressed

10J. A license agreement is needed for the gates in the right-of-way.

Response: Comment acknowledged.

Sheet 5

10K. Change text type, some information is lost throughout the Site Plan.

Response: Comment addressed

10L. Add the bearings, distances and curve data to all the Lots, Tracts and R.O.W. to match the plat information.

Response: Comment addressed

10M. A license agreement is needed for the gates in the right-of-way.



Response: Comment acknowledged.

11. Mile High Flood District (Mark Schutte / 303-455-6277 / submittals@udfcd.org)

11A. Please see attached letter. MHFD has no comments related to the improvements as proposed in the Site Plan. Additional comments are outlined in the review letter related to the drainage report.

Response: Understood