

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



March 27, 2023

Randy Bauer
Clayton Properties Group II / Oakwood Homes
4908 Tower Road
Denver, CO 80249

Re: Second Submission Review – Antelope Creek (Kings Point North) – Site Plan and Plat
Application Number: **DA-1609-23**
Case Numbers: **2022-6050-00, 2022-3081-00**

Dear Mr. Bauer:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on March 6th, 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 April 10th, 2023 in order to be able to retain your estimated Administrative Decision date.

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 May 17th, 2023. Please remember that all abutter notices and 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: Layla Rosales, Terracina Design
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\1600-1699\1609-23rev2



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Storm drain development fees due: **\$42,159.69** [TAPS]
- Pedestrian railing is required adjacent to 3:1 slopes. [Civil Engineering]
- It is not recommended to have the water main go beneath the channel. Is there a way to re-route this condition? [Aurora Water]
- Aurora Forestry is waiting for tree protection plan mylars and bank bond for trees in escrow. [Forestry]
- A number of trail spacing issues related to the golf course and adjacent residential homes were identified. [PROS]
- Numerous labeling corrections requested, see the site plan and plat for full comments. [Real Property]
- See comment letter attached from the Mile High Flood District.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns

1A. There are no community comments on this first review cycle.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

[Site Plan Page 1]

2A. Switch these titles to make clear that this is the site plan and a plat.

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

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

4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues

4A. There were no street or pedestrian comments in this review.

5. Parking Issues

5A. There were no Parking comments on 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 comments on this review.

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

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

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

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

[Site Plan Page 11]

9A. Pedestrian railing is required adjacent to 3:1 slopes per Section 4.02.6 of the Roadway Manual.

[Site Plan Page 12]

9B. Check this area. Max 3:1 slopes. Pedestrian railing is required for sidewalks adjacent to 3:1 slopes.

9C. Pedestrian railing is required adjacent to 3:1 slopes per Section 4.02.6 of the Roadway Manual.

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

10A. There were no more comments from Traffic Engineering on this review.

**11. Aurora Water** (Nina Khanzadeh / 720-859-4365 / nkhanzad@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

[Site Plan Page 1]

11A. PDR to be approved prior to Site Plan approvals.

[Site Plan Page 6]

11B. Adjust match line and sheet number labeling.

[Site Plan Page 11]

11C. Identify ownership. Will this be constructed as part of this set, or through ISP East? Clarify.

11D. Label as private.

11E. Grading in this area is limited to a max of 4:1 due to maintenance staff being able to drive machinery and vehicles.

11F. Clarify further which items are to be included with this site plan and future civil set. Is this storm and water part of this or of ISP east?

11G. Overall, it is not recommended to have the water main go beneath the channel. Is there any way to re-route this?

11H. Show and label ROW limits- TYP.

[Site Plan Page 12]

11I. Identify ownership. Will this be constructed as part of this set, or through ISP East? Clarify.

12. Forestry (Rebecca Lamphear / 303-739-7177 / rlamphea@auroragov.org)

12A. Aurora Forestry is waiting for tree protection plan mylars and bank bond for trees in escrow.

13. Aurora Water/TAPS (Diana Porter / dsporter@auroragov.org)

13A. Storm drain development fees due: \$42,159.69.

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

[Site Plan Page 4]

14A. Just as the regional trail is required to provide a recovery zone on either side, the same rule applies to the low water crossing. Rumble strips should be integrated into each 2' space.

14B. Vertical features, such as the proposed curbs, are hazards to trail users. They also create shy-away distance issues which result in a reduced effective width of the trail, causing potential conflict for opposing trail user movement. These should be replaced with concrete rumble strips.

14C. The width of the low water crossing must be widened by a minimum of 3'.

[Site Plan Page 6]

14D. This circuitous route for the trail is awkward and potentially dangerous due to the longitudinal slope. This situation seems unnecessary and could be avoided by shifting the tee boxes and perhaps the associated fairway and green southward.

14E. This tee box is too close to the trail, not only creating distraction for golfers but also errant golf ball safety concerns for trail users.

[Site Plan Page 11]

14F. The proposed grading in these areas don't appear to be a constraint limiting the ability to eliminate some bends in the trail.

14G. The rear lot lines of the homes are too close to the trail. Ideally, a 30' setback from property lines and fences should be provided, but in this instance a 20' setback would be accepted.

14H. A barrier, such as a pedestrian railing, should be placed at the outside edge of the 2' recovery zone where the adjacent slope is 33.33% or steeper with a 6' drop or greater.

[Site Plan Page 12]

14I. A barrier, such as a pedestrian railing, should be placed at the outside edge of the 2' recovery zone where the adjacent slope is 33.33% or steeper with a 6' drop or greater. [2 comments]

[Landscape Plan Page 3]

14J. This may have been overlooked during review of the ISP East plans, but the plants in this area conflict with the proposed maintenance access.

14K. Have these legends on each landscape plan sheet been updated? Is Winter King Hawthorn still being proposed, as it's no longer in the plant schedule on sheet LN.2.



[Landscape Plan Page 5]

14L. Fix the linework to show trail connectivity. As a confluence point for a neighborhood connection, this should also be a place for a bench, trash can, and pet waster station. It should serve as a pull-off/rest area for southbound trail users after navigating the steeper (nearly 5% grade) trail section to the north.

[Landscape Plan Page 6]

14M. What consideration has been given to the need for protective measures (increased landscaping, netting, etc.) from errant golf balls hitting trail users in this area?

[Landscape Plan Page 7]

14N. A bench or benches should also be provided here.

14O. Redesign should preferably occur in this area to remove the sharp bends in the trail, shift the tee box(ex), and eliminate errant golf ball concerns given the proximity of the trail to golf play. If redesign doesn't occur, what consideration will be given to installing landscaping and netting in this area to provide some degree of protection to trail users?

15. Real Property (Roger Nelson / 720-587-2657 / ronelson@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

[Site Plan Throughout]

15A. Numerous labeling or typo corrections. See the redlines on the Site Plan for the **full** Real Property comments.

[Site Plan Page 5]

15B. Plat shows 55' ROW? & show reception number.

15C. Existing 20' Drainage & Utility Easement Book 6232, Page 527 to be vacated?

15D. Show IREA Easement.

15E. Plat shows differing trail Easement geometry?

[Site Plan Page 6]

15F. Contact Andy Niquette releaseeasements@auroragov.org for the easement concerns.

15G. What is the reception Number? Or is this future?

15H. Plat shows differing geometry?

15I. Label easement & is this to be vacated?

[Site Plan Page 7]

15J. What is the Reception Number or is this for the future?

15K. Contact Andy Niquette releaseeasements@auroragov.org for the easement concerns.

[Site Plan Page 8]

15L. Contact Andy Niquette releaseeasements@auroragov.org for the easement concerns.

[Plat Throughout]

15M. Numerous labeling corrections. See the redlines on the Plat for the **full** Real Property comments.

[Plat Page 1]

15N. Arapahoe County now requires this to be 3" x 7" rectangle.

15O. Graphics shows Block 1?

15P. Title work is now required to be dated within 30 days of plat acceptance date.

[Plat Page 2]

15Q. Add second tie per COA 2022 Subdivision Plat Checklist.

15R. Site Plan shows 66' ROW?

15S. Site plan shows existing 20' utility easement per Chenango Filing No. 3?

[Plat Page 3]

15T. Contact Andy Niquette releaseeasements@auroragov.org for the easement concerns.

15U. Site plan shows existing 20' utility easement per Chenango Filing No. 3?

15V. Site Plan shows differing geometry?

[Plat Page 4]

15W. Contact Andy Niquette releaseeasements@auroragov.org for the easement concerns.

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

16A. There were no more comments from Xcel Energy on this review cycle.



17. E-470 Public Highway Authority (Brandi Kemper / 303-537-3727 / bkemper@e-470.com)

17A. There were no more comments from the E-470 Public Highway Authority.

18. Mile High Flood District (Derek Clark / 303-455-6277 / submittals@udfcd.org)

- 18A. Please help us to understand at what event flow will overtop the main channel into the secondary channel (where the existing channel is now).
- 18B. As the outfalls will be constructed before the channel, please ensure that any adjustments needed to the outfalls occur during channel construction to ensure the outfalls will tie in appropriately.
- 18C. Please provide maintenance access along the channel. There does not need to be a formalized maintenance road but a 10-15' wide graded in bench along the length of the channel would be sufficient so that maintenance equipment can traverse the site without disturbing the golf course.

March 10, 2023

To: Rifka Wine (Aurora)

Via email

Subject: MHFD Review Comments

Re: 1662021 – Antelope Creek Filing 1

<i>For MHFD staff use only.</i>	
Project ID:	106325
Submittal ID:	10010623
MEP Phase:	Referral (2 nd)

This letter is in response to the request for our comments concerning the referenced project. We have reviewed this referral only as it relates to a MHFD drainageway and for maintenance eligibility of storm drainage features, in this case:

- Antelope Creek

MHFD staff have the following comments to offer:

- 1) Please help us to understand at what event flow will overtop the main channel into the secondary channel (where the existing channel is now).
- 2) As the outfalls will be constructed before the channel, please ensure that any adjustments needed to the outfalls occur during channel construction to ensure the outfalls will tie in appropriately.
- 3) Please provide maintenance access along the channel. There does not need to be a formalized maintenance road but a 10-15' wide graded in bench along the length of the channel would be sufficient so that maintenance equipment can traverse the site without disturbing the golf course.

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

Sincerely,



Laura Hinds, P.E.

Project Engineer, Mile High Flood District

lhinds@mhfd.org

cc: Katie Kerstiens (kkerstiens@mhfd.org)