



Planning Division  
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300  
Aurora, Colorado 80012  
303.739.7217

*AuroraGov.org*

April 23, 2025

Julie Hoebel  
Groewood Community Development  
7951 E Maplewood Ave Ste 100  
Greenwood Village, CO 80111

**Re: Second Submission Review: Groewood Stables – Site Plan and Replat**  
**Application Number: DA-2382-01**  
**Case Numbers: 2025-4002-00; 2025-3008-00**

Dear Julie Hoebel:

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on Friday, April 4, 2025. 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.

Please send your case manager an updated introduction letter and site plan with the revised title – SITE PLAN WITH ADJUSTMENT. Please provide these updates to your case manager no later than April 25, 2025. The remaining comments will be resolved during technical submission following the Planning & Zoning Commission hearing. 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 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.

The Planning & Zoning Commission hearing date is set for Wednesday, May 14, 2025. Please remember that all abutter notices for public hearings must be sent, and the site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the hearing date. These notifications are your responsibility, and the lack of proper notification will cause the public hearing 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.

Projects that have gone one year without a submission will be considered inactive and require a 25% restart fee to be reactivated. After 18 months of inactivity, projects that are not reactivated will be closed and retired.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at 303.739.7259 or [amuca@auroragov.org](mailto:amuca@auroragov.org).

Sincerely,

Ariana Muca, Planner III  
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Alisah Hammett Zipper Line Strategies  
Ariana Muca, Case Manager  
Brit Vigil, ODA  
Filed: K:\\$DA\DA-2382-01rev2.rtf



## *Second Submission Review*

### **SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS**

- Please update the letter of introduction to include an explanation of the building frontage adjustment, why the code cannot be met, and mitigation measures proposed to meet the purpose and intent of the regulation being adjusted. This will need to be sent to staff no later than April 25, 2025, to keep the May 14<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission date (Planning).
- According to the comment response document, sanitary loading calculations were sent to me prior to resubmission. However, I did not receive them. Please submit sanitary loading calculations to [waterengineering@auroragov.org](mailto:waterengineering@auroragov.org) and CC Iman Ghazali ([ighazali@auroragov.org](mailto:ighazali@auroragov.org)) before the next submittal. This is to determine if existing infrastructure can support this development, and that the Developer will not be required to upsize existing infrastructure. See Section 5.03.9 of the Water, Sanitary and Storm Infrastructure Standards and Specifications (Aurora Water Utility Manual) for guidance (Utilities).
- Ensure the selected plants are suitable for a wetland area; staff have concerns about the planting around the drainage area (Landscape).
- Ensure all sidewalks are 6' (Public Works).
- Gates or doors that open and encroach into a fire lane easement must be self-closing. The outside horn/strobe for the fire alarm system should be located at this corner on the east side of the building, close to the FDC. Although not directly above the FDC, the outside horn/strobe must be visible to approaching fire apparatus rather than on the side of the building that is not visible (Fire and Life Safety).
- Cherry Creek Schools comments are attached at the end of this letter.

### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

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

- 1A. No comments received during the second review.

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

- 2A. The city staff has the application listed as Grovewood, per the pre-submittal meeting, while the site plan is labeled The Stables. Please update the site plan to read Grovewood to ensure consistency, as abutting property owners and neighboring HOAs have been notified under this name.
- 2B. Update the title to read SITE PLAN WITH ADJUSTMENT rather than SITE PLAN AMENDMENT. This is a new site plan rather than an update or amendment to an existing site plan.
- 2C. Thank you for including the signage in the Data Block; it is indicated that the application will have five sf of signage. Under the allowed signage category, I would update to say per 146-4.10 of the UDO. The site is allowed five signs, and more may be added in the future. This will give flexibility.
- 2D. Please remove the required EV parking in the Data Block. Planning supports the addition of EV parking but has no requirements for this infrastructure.
- 2E. Please include the abutting zone districts on the site plan.
- 2F. The scale on Page 3 remains incorrect. Please update during technical review.
- 2G. Thank you for including the adjustment on the cover sheet. Please update the letter of introduction to include an explanation of why the code cannot be met and mitigation measures proposed to meet the purpose and intent of the regulation being adjusted. This will need to be sent to staff no later than April 25, 2025, to keep the May 14<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission date.
- 2H. Thank you for including the interim conditions/phased plan for the application. Can you please include how the interim condition will be seeded? The assumption is that it would not be dirt; instead, it would be seeded.

#### **3. Streets and Pedestrian Comments**

- 3A. Thank you for removing one of the internal fences; staff thinks the visibility will work as a traffic calming measure for the long stretch of road on the western edge.



#### **4. Parking Comments**

4A. No further comments.

#### **5. Architectural and Urban Design Comments**

5A. No further comments.

#### **6. Signage & Lighting Comments**

6A. No further comments.

#### **7. Landscaping Issues (Tammy Cook / [TammyC@cgasolutions.com](mailto:TammyC@cgasolutions.com) / Comments in bright teal)**

##### *Sheet 14*

7A. For the Non-Street Frontage Buffer Table: the provided number of shrubs on the plan shows 221 but 196 are noted in the table.

##### *Sheet 15*

7B. General comment: Shrubs, perennials and ornamental grasses shall be placed in edged beds and cannot be planted in native seed. Maintenance around these plants will be problematic and the retention of mulch around the plants will be as well. Code requires all plants to be within beds with edger around them.

7C. It appears that this tree and these shrubs are not called out.

7D. Provide a hatch for the material in these areas.

7E. This area does not have the parking lot screened by a double row of shrubs.

7F. This tree against the rain garden area is in the middle of the path. Please shift it over.

7G. Per our discussion, we had asked that the double row of shrubs be placed against the parking lot to screen the cars from the trail and where the edger could contain these beds. Shift the buffer plant material against the parking lot. Per 4.7.5 K. 5.c.ii ii. In lieu of berms, a low continuous landscaped hedge between three and four feet high consisting of a double row of shrubs planted 3 feet on center in a triangular pattern. The NLC gets 1.5'-2' in height and does not meet this requirement for this buffer.

7H. This is not the plant symbol in the Legend for SSB and this is not the symbol on the plan for RAB.

7I. Under ornamental trees revise SER (Serviceberry) from 6" clump to 2" Caliper per the UDO.

7J. Verify with the civil engineer that the 100 WSEL line is in the correct location as it appears to be here.

7K. All of this planting is within the WSEL, do all these varieties do well in these wet conditions? The LEA and TWS are noted as planting that does not do well in wet conditions.

##### *Sheet 16:*

7L. All of this planting is within the WSEL, do all these varieties do well in these wet conditions?

7M. Provide a hatch for the material in these areas.

7N. This is not the plant symbol in the Legend for SSB and this is not the symbol on the plan for RAB.

7O. Per our discussion, we had asked that the double row of shrubs be placed against the parking lot to screen the cars from the trail and where the edger could contain these beds. Shift the buffer plant material against the parking lot. Per 4.7.5 K. 5.c.ii ii. In lieu of berms, a low continuous landscaped hedge between three and four feet high consisting of a double row of shrubs planted 3 feet on center in a triangular pattern. The NLC gets 1.5'-2' in height and does not meet this requirement for this buffer.

7P. Verify with the civil engineer that the 100 WSEL line is in the correct location as it appears to be here.

7Q. All of this planting is within the WSEL, do all these varieties do well in these wet conditions? The LEA and TWS are noted as planting that does not do well in wet conditions.

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

8A. No further comments.



## REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

### **9.Civil Engineering** (Farhad Sarwari/ +1 (303) 7397306 / [fsarwari@auroragov.org](mailto:fsarwari@auroragov.org))

#### *Site Plan*

5 of 29

- 9A. Please hatch existing sidewalk . This should be same hatching that is used for proposed sidewalk, but with gray/lighter color.
- 9B. Per Pre-App notes, this sidewalk easement should be 6' wide, which is correctly shown here. But on the Plat, it is mentioned to be 5.8', see snip. Please correct on the Plat.
- 9C. Proposed features shall be hatched with black.

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

#### *Traffic Study*

- 10A. No further comments.

#### *Site Plan*

- 10B. As stated in previous review, this plan is NOT 20 scale, the bar scale to the right is correct, but the corresponding measurements on the plan do not match.
- 10C. Revise site triangle notes to 2025 COA Roadway Manual, Section 8.B.
- 10D. Update sight triangles to 240'/280' per TE-13.1.

### **11.Utilities** (Fatin “Iman” Ghazali / [ighazali@auroragov.org](mailto:ighazali@auroragov.org)/ Comments in red)

- 11A. The site plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.
- 11B. According to the comment response document, sanitary loading calculations were sent to me prior to resubmission, however I did not receive them. Please submit sanitary loading calculations to [waterengineering@auroragov.org](mailto:waterengineering@auroragov.org) and CC Iman Ghazali ([ighazali@auroragov.org](mailto:ighazali@auroragov.org)) prior to the next submittal. This is to determine if existing infrastructure can support this development and that the Developer will not be required to upsize existing infrastructure. See Section 5.03.9 of the Water, Sanitary and Storm Infrastructure Standards and Specifications (Aurora Water Utility Manual) for guidance.

#### *Utility Plan*

10 of 29

- 11C. Call out connection to existing main along Exposition.
- 11D. Per recent direction, all proposed water, sanitary and storm main diameters and materials shall be removed from Site Plans (TYP).
- 11E. Apologies for my mistake in the last review -- the proposed main is required to tie into the existing main via a manhole and the existing stub shall be removed.
- 11F. Call out proposed valve on existing main.
- 11G. Cleanouts are not allowed on sanitary mains; revise to manholes.
- 11H. Label all sewer lines and sanitary mains.
- 11I. Manholes are required at deflections of sanitary mains. Ensure manhole is not within a crossspan.
- 11J. Are two irrigation meters truly needed for this site? Please provide reasoning.
- 11K. Relocate meter outside of the 100-yr WSEL.
- 11L. License agreement is required for this encroachment -the transformer along the internal drive.

#### *Utility Plan*

11 of 29

- 11M. Revise overlapping text within the document.

#### *Utility Plan*

12 of 29

- 11N. Ensure depiction of water and sanitary mains are consistent with what is shown on the utility sheet (TYP).
- 11O. Provide a legend for this hatching. Be advised that edge of meter pit shall be 2 ft away from hardscape.

#### *Landscape*

- 11P. Ensure depiction of water and sanitary mains are consistent with what is shown on the utility sheet (TYP).



- 11Q. Utility sheet show that an irrigation meter is proposed here. Trees shall have at least 5 ft of clearance and shrubs shall have at least 3 ft of clearance from edge of meter pit.

**12.Aurora Water Revenue** ([moestman@auroragov.org](mailto:moestman@auroragov.org))

- 12A. Storm Drain Development fees due \$5,938.

**1.Fire / Life Safety** (Rich Tenorio / 303-739-7628 / [rtenorio@auroragov.org](mailto:rtenorio@auroragov.org) / Comments in blue)

Sheet 23 & 28

- 1A. Gates or doors that open and encroach into a fire lane easement must be self-closing. The outside horn/strobe for the fire alarm system should be located at this corner on the east side of the building close to the FDC. Although not directly above the FDC, the outside horn/strobe must be visible to approaching fire apparatus rather than on the side of the building that is not visible.

**2.Land Development Services** (Roger Nelson/ [rnelson@auroragov.org](mailto:rnelson@auroragov.org) / Comments in magenta)

- 2A. Comments to be forwarded directly from the Land Development Reviewer.

**3.Land Development Services** (Grace Gray / [ggray@auroragov.org](mailto:ggray@auroragov.org) / 3037397277 / Comments in magenta)

- 3A. All new easements are to be dedicated by plat. Easement releases to be submitted [releaseeasements@auroragov.org](mailto:releaseeasements@auroragov.org).

**4.PROS** (Abigail Scheuermann / 303-739-7169 / [ahscheue@auroragov.org](mailto:ahscheue@auroragov.org))

- 4A. Resolution establishing partnership between the Development and Aurora Housing Authority (AHA) was received by PROS on 4/16/25. Qualified affordable housing constructed in collaboration with the AHA is exempt from PROS land dedication and park fee requirements. As such, these requirements will not apply to this project.

**5.Xcel Energy** (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / [donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto:donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com))

- 5A. No resubmittals are necessary

**6.Cherry Creek Schools** (Matt Schaefer/ [mschaefer2@cherrycreekschools.org](mailto:mschaefer2@cherrycreekschools.org) / 7205545053)

- 6A. See comments below:

Cherry Creek School District #5					
Planning Department					
Student Generation Worksheet - Aurora					
Project Name:		Groveswood Stables			
Project Number:		DA-2382-01			
Developer/Contact Person:		Alisha Hammett, Shopworks Architecture			
Submitted for Review:		2/12/2025			
		85 units on 4.79 acres			
Students Generated					
Type of Unit	#D.U.s	ES	MS	HS	Total
< 7.49 du/ac	0	0	0	0	0
7.5 - 14.99 du/ac	0	0	0	0	0
> 15.00 du/ac	85	6	3	3	12
Totals	85	6	3	3	12
Acres per Child		0.0175	0.025	0.032	
Land Dedication Total		0.11	0.09	0.08	0.2782
Arapahoe County Assessor - Current Land Value				\$ 2,086,520.00	
Arapahoe County Assessor - Acres				4.790	
Arapahoe County Assessor - Current Land Value (per acre)				\$ 435,599.16	
Cash in Lieu of Land Dedication Calculation				\$ 121,167.35	