

May 17, 2024

Debbie Bickmire
City of Aurora
Planning Division
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, CO 80012

RE: Response to Comments

The Aurora Highlands North – Area B – Site Plan – Fifth Review

Application Number: DA-2062-33

Case Numbers: 2022-4027-00

Dear Debbie:

Below are the city comments followed by our responses.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Completeness and Clarity of Application

Note: Lot Tracking Chart has been updated to reflect a revised lot size mix, but overall lot quantities remain the same. There is a very minor Open Space (0.04 ac) decrease in total open space provided due to cul-de-sac revisions in Area A.

Comment

1A. Add “With Adjustment” to the Site Plan title.

Response: Note has been added.

Comment

1B. Revise the private, usable outdoor space in the front yards of motor courts to meet the minimum dimensional requirements.

Response: Private, usable outdoor space in the front yards of motor courts have been revised to meet the minimum dimensional requirements.

Comment

1C. The Lot Key Map on Sheet 6 differs from the Key Map with the landscape plans. The two maps should be consistent or explain the differences.

Response: The Lot Key Map on Sheet 6 has been revised and the Key Map on the landscape plans matches.

Comment

1D. Add the missing linework in PA-35 in the Lot Key Map.

Response: Missing linework has been added.

Comment

1E. Review labels around detention areas to ensure existing vs. proposed improvements are labeled consistently throughout the plans.

Response: Existing, proposed or future has been added to the ponds.

Comment

1F. Revise tract linework so the boundaries are delineated. See redlines around PA-32 for clarification.

Response: The boundaries have been highlighted.

Comment

1G. Ensure all lots have dimensions and lot area.

Response: Dimensions and areas are included for each lot. In locations close to the matchlines they may not be shown on each sheet for plan readability.

Comment

1H. Revise the monument sign labels to be consistent throughout and match the detail label. Clarify the wall heights and show them on the grading plan. Add top and bottom wall heights.

Response: The labels have been revised. These are not retaining walls.

Comment

1I. Include all symbols in the Legend.

Response: Legends have been revised.

Comment

1J. Ensure sight triangles are shown at intersections. Some appear to have dropped off with this review.

Response: Sight triangles have been turned back on.

Comment

1K. See redlines and address all comments and notations.

Response: Redlines have been addressed.

2. Landscaping (Debbie Bickmire / 303-739-7261 / dbickmir@auroragov.org / Comments in teal)

Comment

2A. There are discrepancies between the site plan/landscape sheets identifying what improvements will be constructed with ponds (re: maintenance access vs. trails) or what will be completed in a future phase. Please review and revise accordingly.

Response: Pond labels have been updated to match site plan sheets. Notes indicating that landscape will be designed in a future site plan have been added.

Comment

2B. There are sidewalks/trails in intervening open spaces that don't connect to anything. Add notes to clarify when connections will be designed/constructed.

Response: Trails connecting to pond access paths have been clarified on plans.

Comment

2C. The Lot Key Map differs from the Key Map on Sheet 6. They should be the same. Please explain if there is a reason for the differences.

Response: Lot key map has been revised to match the correct version on sheet 6.

Comment

2E. Add a statement as to who is responsible for the maintenance of tracts.

Response: Statement has been added indicating that the district is responsible for the maintenance of tracts.

Comment

2F. The sum of the areas in the Site Data Table should equal the site total. Please review.

Response: Areas in the Site Data Table have been revised and now add up to the site total.

Comment

2G. Include all symbols/screens in the legend.

Response: All symbols/screens have been included in the legend.

Comment

2H. Thank you, the motorcourt landscape is much better. The landscape shown on the “rear” units is required when units must be turned to face Tracts D and E. Please add a note or include another detail to clarify what is required for each configuration.

Response: Note included clarifying that rear landscape on motor court lots is only required when lots are adjacent to Tracts D or E.

Comment

2I. The open space note with the motorcourt lots has been cut off. Please make sure the full note is visible.

Response: Note has been added to the notes underneath the motorcourt lot detail.

Comment

2J. The landscape typicals are not all consistent with the required plant quantities.

Response: Landscape lot typicals have been revised to be consistent with required plant quantities.

Comment

2K. You can revise the requirement to 1 tree on lots 50’ wide or less, but lots that are 60’ wide should have 2 trees.

Response: Tree requirements for lots 50’ wide or less have been revised to require only 1 tree.

Comment

2L. The masonry wall symbol includes squares that imply columns. Columns should be shown separately to avoid confusion.

Response: Squares on the masonry wall symbol in the legend have been removed. A separate square symbol is indicated for the wall columns.

Comment

2M. Add edger to the legend.

Response: Edger has been added to the legend on all sheets.

Comment

2N. Please dimension the regional trail, identify the trail material, and please clarify when the trail improvements will be provided.

Response: Regional trail has been dimensioned and concrete material identified. Regional trail improvements to be constructed concurrently with adjacent development.

Comment

2O. Ensure Planning Areas are identified on all landscape sheets.

Response: Planning areas have been identified on all landscape sheets.

Comment

2P. Please make sure all tract boundaries are identified. It is hard to differentiate the locations of the tracts along the west side of PA-32.

Response: Tract boundaries have been identified. Especially along the west side of PA 32.

Comment

2Q. The area of Tract A, PA-32 differs on Sheets 18 and 65. Please revise to be consistent.

Response: The area of Tract A, PA-32 has been revised to be consistent with sheet 18.

Comment

2R. Review sidewalk and trail widths for consistency with the site plan sheets.

Response: Trail and sidewalk widths have been reviewed and revised to be consistent with site plan sheets.

Comment

2S. Check the locations of leader lines, and ensure all easements are shown.

Response: Location of leader lines have been checked and all easements are shown.

Comment

2T. Screen linework for adjacent Site Plans.

Response: Linework of adjacent plans has been screened.

Comment

2U. Fix overwrites and move labels that are covering the plans.

Response: Overwrites and labels covering the plans have been checked and fixed.

Comment

2V. Address all comments and notations on the redlines.

Response: All comments and notations on the redlines have been addressed.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

3. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

Comment

3A. The 48th Avenue ISP must be approved before the approval of this Site Plan. As of 1/4/23, the ISP has not been completed.

Response: From the projects search looks like the 48th Ave ISP has been administratively approved.

Comment

3B. Revise the phasing notes to say "48th Avenue design and construction by Aerotropolis Regional Transportation Authority shall be completed before the issuance of any certificate of occupancy or temporary certificate of occupancy."

Response: Notes has been revised.

Comment

3C. Remove all cross pans from the site plan. They will be reviewed/approved with the civil plans. This is new with this submittal.

Response: Cross pans have been removed.

Comment

3D. Verify the sign/retaining walls have a height of less than 4'.

Response: The monument is less than 4', it is not a retaining wall.

4. Traffic Engineering (Carl Harline / 303-739-7548 / charline@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

Comment

4B. Please contact Carl directly for comments.

Response: Carl stated that he did not have any comments.

5. Aurora Water (Iman Ghazali / ighazali@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

Comment

5A. The site plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the preliminary drainage report is approved.

Response: The area B PDR was approved on 4/17/24.

Comment

5B. Where is the rest of the pond noted on Sheet 29?

Response: The entire pond is now showing on sheet 29.

Comment

5C. Add missing slopes per the redlines.

Response: Slopes have been added.

Comment

5D. Add missing manholes on Sheets 46 and 47.

Response: Manholes have been turned back on.

Comment

5E. Identify which infrastructure is proposed with this site plan and show where the proposed storm connects to either the existing storm or any future storm on Sheet 52.

Response: The pond and outlet pipe are being build with area B. The connection to area C has been labeled.

Comment

5F. Identify where the proposed utility connects to existing or future infrastructure on Sheet 57.

Response: Area B and area C labels have been added. The connection to existing occurs on sheet 58.

Sincerely,

MATRIX DESIGN GROUP, INC.

Patrick Chelin, P.E.
Senior Vice President

cc: 21.1229.002