

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



May 22, 2023

Tom Clark  
Ventana Capital, Inc.  
9801 E Easter Ave  
Centennial, CO 80112

**Re: Third Submission Review – Parkland Village 2 – Site Plan and Plat**  
Application Number: **DA-2289-01**  
Case Numbers: **2022-4054-00; 2022-3092-00**

Dear Mr. Clark:

Thank you for your third submission, which we started to process on May 3, 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.

Several important issues remain; however, they may be addressed in a technical review after the administrative decision. Please note that Planning comments have requested a revised plan showing the updated unit counts ahead of the administrative decision. Please send that paperwork directly to [dosoba@auroragov.org](mailto:dosoba@auroragov.org) to be used in the decision. Your administrative decision is tentatively scheduled for June 14, 2023, pending the receipt of the requested revised plans and notice. Public notice signs and mailings will be ready for pick-up on Thursday, May 25, 2023. Please revise your work based on the remaining comments and resubmit for technical review after the administrative decision.

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 303-739-7121 or [dosoba@auroragov.org](mailto:dosoba@auroragov.org).

Sincerely,

Dan Osoba, Planner II  
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Diana Rael, Norris Design  
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison  
Brit Vigil, ODA  
Filed: K:\SDA\2289-01rev3



## Third Submission Review

### SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- (Planning) Correct the number of units to match the plat. This information needs to be updated and the plan submitted prior to the administrative decision.
- (Planning) Provide a detail for an interim and full build-out condition of the emergency access.
- (Landscape) For Townhomes: Per section 4.7.5. J.3.b.ii.-Perimeter plantings shall consist of a total number of plants equal to 1.25 plants per five linear feet of unit perimeter footage, of which:
  - (a) At least five percent are a mixture of evergreen and deciduous trees;
  - (b) At least 15 percent are tall shrubs with a mature height of at least six feet; and
  - (c) Up to 80 percent are a mixture of evergreen and deciduous shrubs chosen to create seasonal interest.
- (Civil) Pre-App notes state coordination is needed between the two developments. Waterstone Civil and Site Plan submittals include S.B. Harvest Road lanes and the west half median curb but do not include Harvest Road median. More coordination is needed to determine which development will construct the median surfacing.
- (PROS) The slope on the trail is not acceptable. Note that the cross slope may not exceed 2%.

### PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

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

- 1A. Comments were received from Xcel Energy and Mile High Flood District on this review. A comment letter from Mile High Flood District was received and is attached to this review letter. The comment from Xcel Energy is below:
- Donna George, Xcel Energy Public Service Co  
550 15<sup>th</sup> St, Ste 700  
Denver, CO 80202  
Phone: 303-571-3306  
Email: [donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto:donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)  
Comment: PSCo/Xcel Energy acknowledges the comment response and needs no resubmittal.
- 1B. No comments were received from adjacent property owners or registered neighborhood organizations during this review.

#### 2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

##### *Site Plan Part 1 Comments*

###### *Sheet 1*

- 2A. Remove one of these duplicate line items for the proposed primary monument sign.  
2B. Please update Kimley-Horn's address.

###### *Sheet 4*

- 2C. Make sure the text does not get cut off. There are several instances throughout the plan.

###### *Sheet 7*

- 2D. Add the linetype for the proposed phase line, typical for all sheets.  
2E. Provide an insert or detail for the interim condition with the temporary emergency access and the final build-out plan that excludes the temporary emergency access.

##### *Site Plan Part 2 Comments*

###### *Sheet 29 (59 of 68)*

- 2F. Fix this leader location.



### **3. Zoning and Subdivision Comments**

#### *Site Plan Part 1 Comments*

##### *Sheet 6*

- 3A. Per the updated plat and lotting, there are 416 total lots. Please revise this table, the unit percentage calculations, and the site plan data table on sheet 1 with the updated numbers. An updated plan with these changes is needed prior to bringing the application to administrative decision.

### **4. Parking Comments**

#### *Site Plan Part 1 Comments*

##### *Sheet 1*

- 4A. Correct the parking requirement and provided a total of 874 per the updated unit count.

### **5. Urban Design Comments**

#### *Site Plan Part 2 Comments*

##### *Sheet 29 (59 of 68)*

- 5A. "Stone-like" needs to be masonry. Provide an updated detail to indicate the material for the veneer.

### **6. Signage Comments**

#### *Site Plan Part 2 Comments*

##### *Sheet 26 (56 of 68)*

- 6A. Add the quantity and square footage of signage for the neighborhood columns to the data block. It appears that the columns are shown in permitted locations - ensure they are located at entrances from arterial/collector streets.

### **7. Landscaping Issues (Tammy Cook / 954-684-0532 / [tdcook@auroragov.org](mailto:tdcook@auroragov.org) / Comments in bright teal)**

#### *Site Plan Part 2 Comments*

##### *Sheet 1 (31 of 68)*

- 7A. Make the corrections per the redlines to the Standard Rights-of-Way Street Tree Table.

##### *Sheet 3 (33 of 68)*

- 7B. There is a Townhome 3 Plex building that needs to be shown as a typical.
- 7C. Greencourts are in buildings with four and five units that need to be shown as a typical.
- 7D. Provide the material for this open space.
- 7E. No Crusher Fines are allowed, it cannot be used as mulch.
- 7F. This hatch pattern appears to be a combination of the private open space screen and artificial turf. Please clarify the hatch and the material for these areas.
- 7G. Provide a typical planting requirement for each single-family and duplex.
- 7H. For all typicals: Water and sewer connections shall be shown where they are shown on the Civil Engineering water/sewer plans.
- 7I. The yard feature should be more than one boulder.
- 7J. Note that the lines that have been crossed out are decisions that should be made by the landscape architect and not the landscape contractor or builder.
- 7K. Note #1 should be shown larger and darker.
- 7L. Show a plant list for each building.
- 7M. The planting bed hatch and the no irrigation zone (rock mulch) when overlaid next to each other on the plan look alike, and it causes confusion. Please modify one of these hatch patterns.

##### *Sheet 4 (34 of 68)*

- 7N. For Townhomes: Per section 4.7.5. J.3.b.ii.-Perimeter plantings shall consist of a total number of plants equal to 1.25 plants per five linear feet of unit perimeter footage, of which:
- (a) At least five percent are a mixture of evergreen and deciduous trees;



- (b) At least 15 percent are tall shrubs with a mature height of at least six feet; and
- (c) Up to 80 percent are a mixture of evergreen and deciduous shrubs chosen to create seasonal interest.
- 7O. The Front and Side yard landscaping needs to be pulled out of this table and listed separately.
- 7P. There is no reference to the required front yard feature.
- 7Q. This hatch pattern appears to be a combination of the private open space screen and artificial turf. Please clarify the hatch and the material for these areas.
- 7R. Note number 1 should be shown larger and darker.
- 7S. Note that the lines that have been crossed out are decisions that should be made by the landscape architect and not the landscape contractor or builder.
- 7T. While the planting layout and quantities appear to be provided, the required/provided needs to be described per the code. Each townhome building should include a plant list for the full building perimeter requirements, and then what will be provided per the code below.
- 7U. This needs to list the building perimeter planting requirements and the types and numbers of plants provided.
- 7V. The planting bed hatch and the no irrigation zone (rock mulch) when overlaid next to each other on the plan look alike, and it causes confusion. Please modify one of these hatch patterns.

*Sheet 7 (37 of 68)*

- 7W. This Map shall be enlarged on this sheet, so the units are more legible.

*Sheet 8 (38 of 68)*

- 7X. The Street trees regardless of who is installing them shall be darkened as they are being counted as the required curbsides landscaping. There are multiple instances of this comment on this sheet.

**8. Addressing** (Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / [pturner@auroragov.org](mailto:pturner@auroragov.org))

- 8A. Addressing comments have been addressed.

**REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

**9. Civil Engineering** (John Springs / 303-739-7572 / [jsprings@auroragov.org](mailto:jsprings@auroragov.org) / Comments in green)

*Site Plan Part 1 Comments*

*Sheet 1*

- 9A. The site plan will not be approved by Public Works until the master plan is approved.
- 9B. The site plan will not be approved by Public Works until the preliminary drainage report is approved.

*Sheet 2*

- 9C. Duplicate notes. Remove one instance.
- 9D. Note 19 is repeated here.

*Sheet 3*

- 9E. Pre-App notes state coordination is needed between the two developments. Waterstone Civil and Site Plan submittals include S.B. Harvest Road lanes and the west half median curb but do not include Harvest Road median. More coordination is needed to determine which development will construct the median surfacing.

*Sheet 6*

- 9F. Coordinate with the adjacent property owner which project will install median cover/median landscaping and reflect this in the landscape plans.

*Sheet 7*

- 9G. Label roadway classification (typical).



- 9H. Do not show crosspans in Site Plan, only show them at the time of Civil Submittal. This is a new direction for Site Plans (typical).

*Sheet 8*

- 9I. Ramps are required to be aligned (max offset is one ramp width). (typical)  
9J. The median may need to be modified to accommodate the pedestrian crossing.

*Sheet 21*

- 9K. Label roadway classification (typical).  
9L. The Max slope is 3:1 per 4.02.7.03 (typical).

*Sheet 24*

- 9M. Advisory note, the concentrated flow will be required to be maintained through the pedestrian path at alley crossings in Civil Plans (typical).

*Sheet 27*

- 9N. Identify this hatch in a legend (typical).

*Sheet 30*

- 9O. Add the luminaire typical.  
9P. Add the note indicating that the light locations are conceptual.

*Site Plan Part 2 Comments*

*Sheet 32 (62 of 68)*

- 9Q. Include SL-4 luminaires for Arterial roadways per 4.10.4.07; Use SL-3 for Collectors.

*Sheet 33 (63 of 68)*

- 9R. Per 4.10.4.07, SL-4 is required for Arterial Roadways (typical).

*Sheet 35 (65 of 68)*

- 9S. Per 4.10.4.07, SL-3 is required for Collector Roadways (typical).  
9T. Per 4.10.4.01.02, two streetlights are required, one at each right approach on the minor street (Collector x Local). (typical).  
9U. Streetlight should be on the right approach of Little River per 4.10.4.01.02 (typical).  
9V. Label roadway classification (typical).

**10. Traffic Engineering (Dean Kaiser / 303-739-7584/ [djkaiser@auroragov.org](mailto:djkaiser@auroragov.org). / Comments in amber)**

*Generally*

- 10A. Note that Traffic Engineering comments made on the redline comments may not be all-inclusive of the comments from Traffic Engineering as they were not reviewed and approved prior to this letter being sent. Please coordinate with Traffic Engineering directly to ensure that these comments are finalized.

*Site Plan Part 1 Comments*

*All Sheets*

- 10B. Need to add the street name sign (D3-1) above the STOP sign. There are several instances throughout the plan.  
10C. Need to add street name signs (D3-1) due to roadway name change.  
10D. Need R11-2 ROAD CLOSED sign.  
10E. Add D3-1 and R11-2 sign details.  
10F. Add W2-6, W16-9P, D3-1 and R11-2 sign details.



- 10G. What are these lane lines for? SB looks like a lane line but narrows down too small for vehicular traffic. Remove.
- 10H. Need W2-6 ROUNDABOUT and W16-9P AHEAD signs.

*Site Plan Part 2 Comments*

*Sheet 8 (38 of 68)*

- 10I. This tree is within 50' from the STOP sign and needs to be removed (per COA's TE13.3).

*Sheet 12 (42 of 68)*

- 10J. There is a tree within 50' of the STOP sign, relocate.

*Sheet 17 (47 of 68)*

- 10K. Confirm meeting sight distance per COA's Roadway Specifications Manual, Figure 4.04.6.04.16.3 – Stopping Sight Distance at Exit.
- 10L. This tree is recommended to be removed for improved sight distance.

**11. Fire / Life Safety (Stephen Kirchner / 303-739-7489 / [stkirchn@auroragov.org](mailto:stkirchn@auroragov.org) / Comments in blue)**

*Site Plan Part 1 Comments*

*Sheet 1*

- 11A. IBC side must be filled out or an exception must be referenced.
- 11B. This is only for Phase 1 of construction. All units from all phases must be included.
- 11C. Provide code year, IBC occupancy type, and construction type in Data Block.

*Sheet 2*

- 11D. Add the note listed below and include the word INFLUENCE between EXCEEDING and UNDER.
- 11E. ATTENTION BUILDING DIVISION: PER ARTICLE XI, C.O.A. BUILDING AND ZONING CODE, SECTION 22-425 THROUGH 22-434, AN ACOUSTIC ANALYSIS, PREPARED BY AN ACOUSTIC EXPERT THAT WILL IDENTIFY BUILDING DESIGN FEATURES NECESSARY TO ACCOMPLISH EXTERIOR NOISE REDUCTION TO ACHIEVE INTERIOR NOISE LEVELS NOT EXCEEDING UNDER WORSE-CASE NOISE CONDITIONS.

*Sheet 6*

- 11F. See the notes for requirements for phased construction sites and projects listed on this site plan.
- 11G. Provide details of the temporary fire access road. Ensure compliance with note 1 of the phased construction provided on this sheet.
- 11H. Include note 2 on all sheets that show phasing.

*Sheet 20*

- 11I. Accessible units will require accessible routes. Please show it on grading sheets.
- 11J. Using a heavy dashed delineation, show the accessible route on the grading plan.
- 11K. ICC A117.1 Accessible and Usable Buildings and Facilities: The running slope of walking surfaces shall not be steeper than 1:20 (5% slope). The cross slope of a walking surface shall not be steeper than 1:48 (2% slope).

*Site Plan Part 2 Comments*

*Sheet 8 (38 of 68)*

- 11L. Please use the symbol shown on the redlines and designation for all fire hydrants (typical).

*Sheet 32 (62 of 68)*

- 11M. Show the accessible route on the photometric plan. Refer to the notes on the redlines regarding site amenities and marked crosswalks, and accessible units.



**12. Aurora Water** (Cliff Stephen / 303-739-7490 / [cstephen@auroragov.org](mailto:cstephen@auroragov.org) / Comments in red)

12A. Aurora Water's comments have been addressed.

**13. PROS** (Michelle Teller / 303-739-7437 / [mteller@auroragov.org](mailto:mteller@auroragov.org) / Comments in mauve)

*Site Plan Comments*

*Sheet 21*

- 13A. The slope on the trail is not acceptable. Note that the cross slope may not exceed 2%.
- 13B. Per ADA requirements, the cross slope may not exceed 2.38%. Please revise.
- 13C. All areas within the field must be under 2%. Verify that this is not within the soccer field but the perimeter turf.
- 13D. Since this is a soccer field, 2% is the max accepted. PROS suggests taking one last look and seeing if there's an opportunity to flatten this out closer to 1% for a better field experience.

*Sheet 55*

- 13E. Photo chosen does not represent an inclusive swing, please update.
- 13F. Most elements do not include ages 2-5 as required. Also, include a toddler swing in the set or a tot slide.

**14. Real Property** (Roger Nelson / 720-587-2657 / [ronelson@auroragov.org](mailto:ronelson@auroragov.org) / Comments in magenta)

*Site Plan Part 1 Comments*

*Generally*

- 14A. Reference the redlines for a full list of all comments, corrections, questions, and edits.

*Sheet 1*

- 14B. Match the plat legal description.

*Sheet 7-9*

- 14C. Add the street names called out on the redlines.

*Plat Comments*

- 14D. Please see the redlines on the plat for comments, questions, and corrections.
- 14E. Provide the certificate of taxes due showing that all taxes have been paid in full.
- 14F. Provide updated title work to be dated within 30 days of the plat acceptance date.
- 14G. Provide an updated closure report to match the revised exterior boundary.
- 14H. Label all bearings and distances.
- 14I. Label the arc length where the easement crosses.
- 14J. Fix the obscured text.
- 14K. Remove the label because it will no longer be known by the aliquot part following the subdivision process. There are several instances throughout.
- 14L. Label all easements.
- 14M. Label all radii bearings.

**MAINTENANCE ELIGIBILITY PROGRAM (MEP)****MHFD Referral Review Comments**

For Internal MHFD Use Only.	
MEP ID:	106325
Submittal ID:	10010964
Partner ID:	1673593
MEP Phase:	Referral

**Date:** May 11, 2023  
**To:** Daniel Osoba  
*Via Aurora Website*  
**RE:** MHFD Referral Review Comments

<b>Project Name:</b>	PARKLANDS VILLAGE 2
<b>Location:</b>	Aurora
<b>Drainageway:</b>	Coal Creek

This letter is in response to the request for our comments concerning the referenced project. We have reviewed this proposal only as it relates to maintenance eligibility of major drainage features, in this case:

- Outfall and Emergency Spillway from Full Spectrum Detention Pond H

We have the following comments to offer for the Sand Creek watershed portion of this development:

- 1) Sheet L-119 of the site plan submittal seems to show proposed trees within the limits of the detention pond's emergency spillway. Please ensure there are no plantings that would impede emergency overflows within the limits of the emergency spillway.
- 2) We will continue to coordinate with the developer's consultant relating to comments provided with the public works review of this development with RSN 1674769.

**MHFD requires responses to the review comments, please include these responses with any future submittal.**

We appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,



Derek Clark, PE  
Project Manager  
Mile High Flood District