

March 16, 2023

City of Aurora
Daniel Osoba
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Suite 5200
Aurora, Colorado 80012

Re: **Parklands – Village Two (DA-2289-01) / Initial Submission Response**

Dear Mr. Osoba:

Thank you for taking the time to review our pre-application submission for the Parklands – Village Two along with City staff and providing valuable feedback, which was received on December 21, 2022. Comment responses have been addressed on the following pages.

Please feel free to contact me directly should you have any other comments, questions and/or special requests for additional information. We look forward to working with you to make this project a success.

Sincerely,
Norris Design



Diana Rael
Principal

Initial Submission Review

KEY ISSUES

- A First Review Neighborhood Meeting is required prior to your second submission.
- Greencourt units must be included in the lot tracking table.
- Small lot percentages exceed 50%, therefore the adjustment standards in the Master Plan shall be applied.
- The northern two blocks of single-family detached units exceed 1,000 linear feet. Revise the lot type within the blocks to ensure a single housing type does not exceed 1,000 linear feet.
- Include a Plant List with sizes of plant material specified. The Plant List should be specific to what will ultimately fit in these lot typicals.
- A phasing plan is required with the site and civil plan submittal. Phasing plan must illustrate and describe phasing to the overall site and subsequent phasing, to include looped water and approved two points of access. Check with other departments for required phasing provisions.
- 30' wide loop lanes typically require a 23' fire lane easement with 766' for parking. This configuration appears to be outside of our normal standard. Therefore, a meeting with Engineering, Planning, and Fire Life Safety to determining the appropriate requirements for the proposed loop lane will be needed. Please coordinate with your ODA Project Manager, Brit Vigil, to schedule this meeting.
- Temporary access may be required to the sanitary sewer manholes depending on timing of Harvest Rd improvements.
- Neighborhood park slopes per the grading plan are too steep to accommodate a field. Please use a max of 2%.
- Provide a local trail connection to the south to connect through to the school site as shown in the master plan. This can be an enhanced sidewalk which provides a safe and strong corridor and crosswalks and wider walks at 6' – 8'.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns

1A. Comments were received from Xcel Energy, Mile High Flood District, and Arapahoe County on this review. Please reference the attached comments at the end of this letter. It is expected that their comments are addressed in your response to comments letter when you resubmit.

Response: Comment noted, thank you.

1B. Six (6) comments were received from adjacent property owners during this review. The full list of comments is below. Per Section 146-5.3.1.C, a First Review Neighborhood Meeting will be required prior to your second submission. Please coordinate with your Case Manager and Scott Campbell (scampbel@auroragov.org) to schedule a virtual meeting. Please be prepared to address the concerns listed below during the neighborhood meeting. Any commitments or answers to these questions as discussed during the meeting will be expected to be included in the response to the comments letter when you resubmit.

Response: Noted, thank you.

1C.

Name: Vercila Chacon

Address: 25604 E. Byers Drive, Aurora CO 80018

Email: vercila1@gmail.com

Comment: This project offers more housing in the area. Concerns are: It increases traffic tremendously. Right now we have to travel several miles in any direction to access grocery stores, health & community services. What is being done about this? Are more schools being built to offset the current overcrowding

in the existing schools? These concerns will affect families/residents currently living in this area and yet, we have no voice as your letter states that this case is "scheduled to be processed administratively, without a Planning Commission public hearing". I ask WHY? Residents need to be involved.

Response: Community comments were addressed at a neighborhood meeting held on February 15, 2023.

1D.

Name: Chris Pichon

Address: 25244 E Byers Dr, Aurora CO 80018

Email: ctpichon@comcast.net

Comment: Please consider redoing the traffic flow analysis for accuracy. Seems the original analysis was done during the covid pandemic lockdowns with minimal traffic flow, and not during an active school season (because of summer break). There's Vista Peak Exploratory and Vista Peak Preparatory and when session, significantly increases traffic flow on Harvest and Alameda. Must factor this in along with the proposed dwellings to properly expand Alameda and Harvest.

Response: Community comments were addressed at a neighborhood meeting held on February 15, 2023.

1E.

Name: Shaina Honsberger

Organization:

Address: 25801 E Byers Pl, Aurora CO 80018

Email: Shainakay@hotmail.com

Comment: Our community can not support 415 more family units. The roads in our area are terrible, we have no police presence, and Vista Peak Exploratory doesn't have adequate parking for pick up after school. The Gun Club/Alameda intersection needs a light (or round about) if more traffic will be using it and gun club should be expanded to 4 lanes. Maybe if the infrastructure in the area was upgraded and we had better police response. But until then, it will not benefit our community but drain the little resources we have.

Response: Community comments were addressed at a neighborhood meeting held on February 15, 2023.

1F.

Name: Gary Maziarz

Address: 257 S Irvington St, Aurora CO 80018

Phone: 7604192781

Email: gmaziarz1@gmail.com

Comment: The area in question along Alameda is used for high-speed car racing. Likewise, Alameda at Harvest is the meeting point and "starting line" for street racing north on Harvest.

Aurora Police Department is currently understaffed and preoccupied with more urban areas of Aurora. Any new development or new streets will only give illegal racing MORE un-patrolled areas that law enforcement will not address, leaving local citizens in danger and aggravated by continuous noise violations.

Response: Community comments were addressed at a neighborhood meeting held on February 15, 2023.

1G.

Name: Christopher Wiethe

Email: wiethe.chris@gmail.com

Comment: There is a herd of Pronghorn and Mule deer that live on the land that is proposed to be

developed. Putting in a high density 415 unit neighborhood will displace these animals and/or push them into highly trafficked roads, potentially creating car accidents. Furthermore, there are active ranchers that ride their horses on Alameda and putting in a 415 unit home will increase traffic and potentially cause accidents with the horses the ranchers use. One horse has already been hit and killed by a driver on Alameda Ave. I feel putting in this dense of a neighborhood is a large risk to the community and agriculture that is in the area.

Response: Community comments were addressed at a neighborhood meeting held on February 15, 2023.

1H.

Name: Jesus Lozano

Email: heyzeushman@yahoo.com

Comment: What are motor courts?

The plans do not show the expansion of Alameda Parkway all the way through to Gun Club Rd. This will cause bottlenecks therefore I am in opposition of this project.

Response: Community comments were addressed at a neighborhood meeting held on February 15, 2023.

2. Completeness and Clarity of Application

Sheet 1

2A. The title should read: "Parklands – Village 2 Site Plan".

Response: Comment noted, this has been updated on the cover sheet.

2B. The data block is incomplete. Revise to include all items required by the Site Plan Manual.

Response: Comment noted. The data block has been updated per the template provided by Aurora.

2C. Remove PC and CC as they are not required with this application.

Response: Comment noted, this has been updated on the cover sheet.

Sheet 2

2D. Refer to the Site Plan Manual for a full set of the required Site Plan Notes. Several notes are incomplete and need to be filled in.

Response: Comment noted, the notes have been updated.

Sheet 4

2E. The ROW should also be labeled on the front of the duplex and townhome lot typicals.

Response: ROW has been labeled.

Sheet 7

2F. Please provide a hatching legend, typical.

Response: Hatching Legend has been added.

Sheet 29

2G: Clarify note 6.

Response: Note has been clarified.

3. Zoning and Subdivision Comments

Generally

3A. The percentage of small lots in this site plan exceeds 50% and must comply with the adjustment standards approved in the Parklands Master Plan. Please reference those standards and ensure this site plan

complies with all standards. The lots along the northern property line are adjacent to an arterial street and must comply with the limit of 1,000 linear feet of the same housing type.

Response: Adjustment was approved as part of the Master Plan on 6/22/22.

Sheet 1

3B. Remove the adjustment request. It has already been requested and approved on the Master Plan.

Response: Comment noted, adjustment has been removed from the cover sheet.

Sheet 4

3C. Provide the lot depth, typical on all types.

Response: Lot depth added to all types.

3D. Correct the setback to "Rear: 10-feet".

Response: Addressed. Setbacks updated to 13' for single-family detached lots in order to maintain 5' structure setback from the 8' utility easement along the back of lots.

3E. Provide separate lot typical for greencourt units. This typical should show the common area and required greencourt separation distances. Notes may be added to be consistent with requirements for the percentage of open space and utility placement.

Response: Addressed.

Sheet 6

3F. Per the Master Plan adjustment standards, the maximum length of the same unit type is 1,000' along an arterial. The blocks shown are ~1,200 linear feet each.

Response: Addressed. Housing type distribution along Alameda Avenue has been updated to comply with Master Plan.

3G. Greencourt duplexes count as greencourt units, not duplexes. Please see the redlines for the highlighted units.

Response: Addressed. Site plan layout has been updated and greencourt duplex units are no longer proposed.

3H. Greencourt townhomes count as greencourt units, not townhomes; therefore, they count towards small Lots.

Response: Addressed. Greencourt units separated into their own unit type in the lot count summary table.

3I. If there is intervening common open space between the front property line and the ROW in the configuration shown, then the townhomes fronting onto Road 4 will be classified as greencourts.

Response: Addressed. The site plan layout has been updated and townhomes are no longer proposed along Road 4 with intervening common open space.

3J. Where feasible and when it is not being used to comply with landscape buffer requirements, tracts of open space between side property liens and the ROW should be avoided, typical.

Response: Addressed. Separate landscape tracts along Road 4 ROW have been removed and incorporated into lots.

3K. For the purposes of maintaining an accurate lot count, the end units on several of the blocks appear to be larger. Ensure that if they are 50' or 60' that they are accurately tracked and labeled on this sheet.

Response: Lots with side yards along collector or local streets (corner lots) are larger than lots with side yards adjacent to other lots. An extra 10' of width is added to lots with sides along local street ROW and an extra 15' width is added to lots with sides along collector street ROW. This is due to the City of Aurora UDO 416-4.2.2 Table 4.2-2 which describes side building setbacks along local/collector streets. This extra space is added to maintain the same potential housing product size as the other lots in the same unit type category.

3L. Remove 30 townhomes configured on a greencourt from the table.

Response: Addressed.

3M. Remove 16 duplexes configured on a greencourt.

Response: The site plan layout has changed and duplexes are no longer proposed in greencourt layouts. Lotting table adjusted to separate duplexes and greencourts.

3N. A minimum of 4 housing types are required per Table 4.2-7 for this site plan. More than 4 are provided, so at least 4 of the unit types must retain at least 10% of the percentage of the total units to comply with the Master Plan adjustment standards.

Response: Addressed. Lot type distribution/configuration has been updated to comply with the Master Plan.

3O. Add a line item for greencourts to the table (46 total).

Response: Addressed. Greencourt line item added to the table on sheet 6, new site plan has 54 total.

3P. The highlighted units on the redlines (including the 46 greencourts) count toward the small lot total percentage: $253/415 = 61\%$ small lots. Note that the Master Plan adjustment standards will be applied towards this site plan review.

Response: Noted. Small lot percentage has been added to the overall site plan sheet. New site plan has 58%.

Sheet 11

3Q. Provide a dimension line for the 20.5'. Is this from the property line to property line; building face to building face?

Response: These dimensions are labeling property line to property line.

3R. Do the motor court units face or front onto Tract J? This will not change the lot/housing type; however, if they face south, please add a note stating the front façade of the motor court units will face onto the tract area

Response: Motor court units are no longer proposed in the new site plan layout.

Sheet 29

3S. Include a greencourt lot typical.

Response: Greencourt lot typical has been included.

Sheet 36

3T. At least 50% of the greencourt open space area shall be landscaped and designed to accommodate foot traffic and play areas. Please provide this calculation in the subsequent submission, typical for all greencourts.

Response: Greencourt requirements have been added to the plan.

4. Streets & Pedestrian Comments

Sheet 7

4A. Will the sidewalk continue onto the alley in the motor court? Or will there be fencing along the back of Alley T?

Response: *This sidewalk will continue onto the alley. No fencing will be constructed at the end of the alley to provide connectivity.*

Sheet 8

4B. Typical for all streets: coordinate with Phil Turner (pcturner@auroragov.org) to obtain street names for this subdivision. He will need the GIS/CAD drawing to assign street names and addresses.

Response: *CAD sent over to Phil Turner to obtain street names.*

Sheet 11

4C. Label and show the curb ramps on alley crossings, typical.

Response: *Curb Ramps with detectable warning added to alley crossings.*

4D. There should be directional receiving ramps for the east/west pedestrian path on Tract Z.

Response: *Addressed. Directional mid-block ramp added in this area for trail continuation.*

4E. The pedestrian connection terminates at the alley with no opposing connection. Consider mirroring the townhome block to align the connection with the sidewalk to the north on the greencourt units. Include receiving ramps on both sides and a crosswalk.

Response: *Site plan layout has changed, and pedestrian connections revised surrounding alley-loaded housing products.*

4F. Show and label all crosswalk striping, typical for all intersections.

Response: *Code advises to coordinate with city traffic manager regarding placement of crosswalk markings.*

Sheet 13

4G. See comments regarding the loop lane section and revise accordingly.

Response: *Noted. The loop lane is no longer proposed in the revised site plan layout.*

4H. Provide the pedestrian connections at the roundabout as shown on the redlines.

Response: *Addressed. Pedestrian connections have been added to the roundabout.*

5. Parking Comments

Sheet 3

5A. *Parking should only occur on the exterior (house facing) side of the loop lane ROW.*

Response: *Noted. The loop lane is no longer proposed in the revised site plan layout.*

Sheet 11

5B. *Label the guest parking spaces. Include these in the site plan data table.*

Response: *Noted. Off-pavement guest parking spaces are no longer proposed in the revised site plan layout.*

6. Urban Design Comments

Sheet 51

6A. *Maximum residential fence height is 72".*

Response: *Fence height has been reduced.*

7. **Signage Comments**

Sheet 48

7A. Note for all signage: monument sign locations must be included on all site plan sheets.

Response: Signage has been shown on all corresponding sheets.

7B. Note: monument sign details are required to match the monument sign on site. When engineering has been completed on these signs, please incorporate it into this plan set. Provide signage square footage on the site plan data block.

Response: Signage engineering will be added when completed. Signage Square footage has been added to the site plan block.

8. **Landscaping Issues** (Tammy Cook / 954-684-0532 / tdcook@auroragov.org)

Site Plan Comments

Sheet 3

8A. Note that the Tract ID's in this set do not correlate with the Plat Tract ID's and shall be updated.

Response: Addressed. Tract ID's updated to match final plat.

8B. These tracts are parking spaces but the material has not been noted as previously on the plans

Response: Noted. Off-pavement parking spaces are no longer proposed in the revised site plan layout.

Sheet 11

8C. Provide material for parking spaces

Response: Noted. Off-pavement parking spaces are no longer proposed in the revised site plan layout.

Sheet 15

8D. Provide Tract ID – A? See the redlines for all instances of this comment.

Response: Addressed. Tract ID's updated to match final plat.

8E. The item called out in the redlines should be a tract letter and not a number.

Response: Addressed. Tract ID's updated to match final plat.

Sheet 20

8F. Provide material and striping for parking spaces.

Response: Noted. Off-pavement parking spaces are no longer proposed in the revised site plan layout.

Sheet 27

8G. Make all the corrections as noted in the standard rights-of-way street tree table.

Response: Corrections have been made.

8H. Add the directional labels to the curbside plantings table.

Response: Labels have been added to the curbside planting table.

8I. Show street A north and south

Response: Street A north and south has been added.

Sheet 28

8J. Make the corrections as noted in the open space landscape tract table.

Response: Open space tract table has been updated.

Sheet 29

8K. The tree called out on the duplex typical needs to be a much smaller variety as the root space is very limited.

Response: The tree specified in the duplex typical should fit the area and have adequate root space to grow.

8L. The tree symbols need to be shown smaller and the tree selected needs to be carefully specified as a smaller variety.

Response: Tree symbols have been updated to be shown more accurately. Tree species should accommodate the space.

8M. See the example provided as what is being expected for the lot typicals.

Response: Referenced, thank you.

8N. Provide a specific plant list. City staff needs to verify that the plant material being selected will work given the size of the lots.

Response: A specific plant list has been added.

8O. Include a Plant List with sizes of plant material specified. The Plant List should be specific to what will ultimately fit in these lot typicals.

Response: A plant list has been added.

8P. Include the approximate location of the utilities and driveways going to each lot and label any easements.

Response: All approximate utilities and driveways and easements have been added.

8Q. Provide a sheet designating the lot types and then under each lot type category, provide a list of expected plant material to be included in that lot type.

Response: Sheet has been added and the plant list has been added to the sheet.

Sheet 30

8R. Label the street frontage buffer and provide the dimension.

Response: Street frontage buffer has been added with dimensions.

8S. For all internal streets noted as Homebuilder Planting: provide the specific planting layout of the curbside landscape, a hatch pattern is not acceptable.

Response: Per our meeting and updated direction with the city on 1/17/23, the planting layout of the curbside landscape will be shown on the lot typicals, along with requirements.

Sheet 31

8T. For all internal streets noted as Homebuilder Planting: provide the specific planting layout of the curbside landscape, a hatch pattern is not acceptable.

Response: Per our meeting and updated direction with the city on 1/17/23, the planting layout of the curbside landscape will be shown on the lot typicals, along with requirements.

Sheet 32

8U. Show the stop sign and provide 50' clearance to the first street tree.

Response: Stop signs have been shown along with 50' clearance for street trees.

8V. Label the open space area as Tract A.

Response: Labels have been updated.

8W. Label the street frontage buffer and provide the dimensions.

Response: Street frontage has been labeled with dimensions.

8X. For all internal streets noted as Homebuilder Planting: provide the specific planting layout of the curbside landscape, a hatch pattern is not acceptable.

Response: Per our meeting and updated direction with the city on 1/17/23, the planting layout of the curbside landscape will be shown on the lot typicals, along with requirements.

Sheet 33

8Y. Note and show the stop sign, typical.

Response: Stop sign has been shown along with 50' clearance for street trees.

8Z. Label Tract AA.

Response: Labels have been updated.

8AA. For all internal streets noted as Homebuilder Planting: provide the specific planting layout of the curbside landscape, a hatch pattern is not acceptable.

Response: Per our meeting and updated direction with the city on 1/17/23, the planting layout of the curbside landscape will be shown on the lot typicals, along with requirements.

Sheet 34

8BB. For all internal streets noted as Homebuilder Planting: provide the specific planting layout of the curbside landscape, a hatch pattern is not acceptable.

Response: Per our meeting and updated direction with the city on 1/17/23, the planting layout of the curbside landscape will be shown on the lot typicals, along with requirements.

8CC. Ensure that the first street tree is 50-feet in advance of the stop sign.

Response: The first street tree is 50' from the stop sign.

Sheet 35

8DD. Street trees cannot be within 50' of a stop sign.

Response: Street trees have been adjusted out of the 50' zone of the stop signs.

8EE. For all internal streets noted as Homebuilder Planting: provide the specific planting layout of the curbside landscape, a hatch pattern is not acceptable.

Response: Per our meeting and updated direction with the city on 1/17/23, the planting layout of the curbside landscape will be shown on the lot typicals, along with requirements.

Sheet 36

8FF. Label the tract.

Response: Labels have been updated.

8GG. On sheet 3, this tract is shown as parking and also landscape – identify if this is pervious or impervious.

Response: This parking area has been removed.

8HH. A tree is required in the island.

Response: Tree requirements have been updated.

8II. For all internal streets noted as Homebuilder Planting: provide the specific planting layout of the curbside landscape, a hatch pattern is not acceptable.

Response: Per our meeting and updated direction with the city on 1/17/23, the planting layout of the curbside landscape will be shown on the lot typicals, along with requirements.

8JJ. Label the street frontage buffer and provide the dimension.

Response: Street frontage has been labeled with dimensions.

Sheet 38

8KK. For all internal streets noted as Homebuilder Planting: provide the specific planting layout of the curbside landscape, a hatch pattern is not acceptable.

Response: Per our meeting and updated direction with the city on 1/17/23, the planting layout of the curbside landscape will be shown on the lot typicals, along with requirements.

8LL. Label this Tract R

Response: Labels have been updated.

Sheet 39

8MM. Label the street frontage buffer and provide the dimension.

Response: Street frontage has been labeled with dimensions.

8NN. Remove this street tree and show the stop sign. Note that the ornamental tree may also need to be Removed.

Response: Trees have been updated accordingly.

8OO. For all internal streets noted as Homebuilder Planting: provide the specific planting layout of the curbside landscape, a hatch pattern is not acceptable.

Response: Per our meeting and updated direction with the city on 1/17/23, the planting layout of the curbside landscape will be shown on the lot typicals, along with requirements.

Sheet 41

8PP. If an ISP number exists, please reference that number here.

Response: Noted, number will be updated.

Sheet 45

8QQ. Provide the percentage of the overall landscape water uses.

Response: Percentages of the overall landscape water uses have been added.

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

9A. 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: Addressed - a DWG was sent over to Phil Turner for street names. Street names updated in this site plan submittal.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

10. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham | 303-739-7403 | jbingham@auroragov.org)

Site Plan Comments

Sheet 1

10A. The site plan will not be approved by public works until the master plan is approved.

Response: Noted.

10B. The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage report is approved.

Response: Noted, PDR will be updated concurrently with the site plan.

Sheet 3

10C. Match the master plan. It defines a 6' walk on both sides.

Response: Collector walks updated to 6' walk to be in line with both the Master Plan PIP and Aurora Standard sections, per email coordination with Julie Bingham.

Sheet 7.

10D. Keep the model numbers generic, include the pole height. Just specify the manufacturer and type. For example: "SL-2: Signify Lumec, RoadFocus fixture" 25' max pole height.

Response: Addressed.

10E. For ex: "SL-3: Signify Lumec Roadfocus fixture" 30' Max pole height.

Response: Addressed.

10F. Update the opposing ramps to current standards (directional ramps).

Response: Aerial imaging appears to show directional ramps are already in place (snip provided on plans with comments). The Civil Plans will evaluate the existing directional ramps to ensure ADA standards are met.

10G. "SL-1: Architectural Area Lighting, Providence Medium" 20' Max pole height.

Response: Addressed.

10H. If these are actually public pedestrian lights, please ensure they match one of the fixtures of the draft preapproved public street light list.

Response: Addressed. Description updated per the pre-approved public street light list.

10I. Show the detectable warnings at sidewalks crossing alleys, typical.

Response: Addressed. Detectable warnings were added to site plan where applicable.

10J. Show the detectable warnings at all ADA ramps, typical.

Response: Addressed.

10L. Please add the following note, typical: "Proposed Street light locations are conceptual. Final locations will be determined with photometric analysis submitted with the street lighting plans in the civil plan submittal."

Response: Addressed. Note added to Site Plan sheets.

10L. Label the crossspans, typical.

Response: Addressed. Crossspans have been labeled.

10M. Label the FL radius of the cul-de-sac.

Response: Noted. Cul-de-sac no longer proposed in the revised site plan layout. Flowline radii labeled for the two proposed eyebrows.

Sheet 9

10N. Update the opposing ramps to current standards (directional ramps)

Response: *Aerial imaging appears to show directional ramps are already in place (snip provided on plans with comments). Please confirm*

10O. IS this ROW already dedicated? Or is it being dedicated with this application?

Response: *57' south of the centerline is proposed and being dedicated with this application. 57' north of centerline is already dedicated. Dimensions have been added to show prop/ex.*

10P. Show/label maintenance access on the site plan.

Response: *Addressed. Maintenance access added and labeled on the site plan.*

Sheet 11.

10Q. Dimension the parking spaces. Is there a curb protecting the sidewalk from parked vehicles?

Response: *Noted. Off-pavement parking spaces are no longer proposed in the revised site plan layout.*

Sheet 13

10R. This is not a public street section, so this area should not be ROW.

Response: *Noted. The loop lane road is no longer proposed in the revised site plan layout.*

Sheet 16.

10S. It is encouraged to not have slopes less than 0.8% to minimize maintenance icing problems.

Response: *Addressed. Grading updated for roadway centerlines to be 0.8% minimum slope. Roads that do not meet this criterion will be updated during final grading.*

Sheet 19.

10T. Typical for both ponds: minimum 2% slope in the bottom of the pond.

Response: *Noted, final grading for ponds will be done with CD submittal. A 0.5% slope will be maintained within proposed trickle channel and 2% grade maintained for flows to reach trickle channel.*

Sheet 22

10U. Maximum 3% for 95' for both public local streets and private streets as they approach a through the street. Section 4.05.4.1 from the Roadway Manual.

Response: *Addressed. Slope is now graded in at 3%.*

Sheet 23

10V. Include sit plan sheets for the improvements called out on the redlines.

Response: *Addressed.*

Sheet 24.

10W. Show the maintenance access road on the site plan.

Response: *Addressed.*

Plat Comments

10X. Minimum 55 feet property line radius.

Response: *New site plan does not have a cul-de-sac in the northwest corner anymore, so comment is no longer applicable.*

11. **Traffic Engineering (Carl Harline | 303-739-7371 | charline@auroragov.org)**

11A. Traffic Engineering comments were not complete prior to this review. There are redlines on the plan set;

however, they have not been finalized and are subject to change. Please refer to the full set of completed comments that will be sent separately by Traffic Engineering. Please contact Traffic Engineering if you have any questions.

Response: Noted. Traffic engineering comments were received via email by Carl Harline and addressed accordingly.

12. Fire/Life Safety (Will Polk | 303-739-7371 | wpolk@auroragov.org)

Site Plan Comments

Sheet 1

12A. A phasing plan is required with the site and civil plan submittal. Phasing plan must illustrate and describe phasing to the overall site and subsequent phasing, to include looped water and approved two points of access. Check with other departments for required phasing provisions.

Response: A phasing plan was added to both the lotting plan and the utility plan.

12B. Data block should include

- Number of buildings, square footage of each building and gross square footage of all buildings on site.
- 2015 or 2021 IRC construction type of structures. Indicate if the structures are fire sprinkled or non-fire sprinkled
- Maximum residential height
- Number of stories (average for each story)
- Handicap parking spaces provided
- Handicap parking spaces are required
- Parking spaces provided
- Parking spaces required

Response: Comment noted, the development is for single-family dwellings, residential building height, parking spaces provided, etc are per code. Square footage for each building is not included due to their being 400+ dwellings proposed for this submittal.

12C. Please fill out the implementation plan required for the 55 townhomes. See the redlines for details.

Response: Comment noted, this has been included on the cover sheet.

Sheet 2

12D. Add influence on this line

Response: Comment noted.

12E. Remove notes 8 and 9

Response: Notes have been removed from sheet.

12F: Have you contacted USPS about kiosk locations? Has delivery method been approved?

Response: Comment noted, item is in progress.

12G: Remove note 1

Response: Note has been removed from sheet.

Sheet 3

12H. Plat must reflect the fire lane easement

Response: Addressed.

12I. Show the fire hydrant. There are several instances of this comment throughout.

Response: *Fire hydrants are shown on utility sheets. All hydrants placed 3.5' from back of curb.*

12J. 30' wide loop lanes typically require a 23' fire lane easement with 766' for parking. This configuration appears to be outside of our normal standard. Therefore, a meeting with Engineering, Planning, and Fire Life Safety to determine the appropriate requirements for the proposed loop lane will be needed. Please coordinate with your ODA Project Manager, Brit Vigil, to schedule this meeting.

Response: *Noted. The modified local street section for the loop lane is no longer proposed in the revised site plan layout.*

12K. The tract table is not consistent with cross-sections and the plat.

Response: *Addressed.*

Sheet 5

12L. Will you be constructing Harvest Road to the south of the residences? If so, please include it in the roadway details.

Response: *No, Harvest Road will be constructed to the intersection of Road 4. South of Road 4, the right-of-way will be dedicated for Storm Water out-falling to Pond H along with the construction of the Sewer main for its connection to the SENAC interceptor line.*

Sheet 6

12M. Fire Lane easements must be shown in alleys with "6-pac" configurations, typical.

Response: *Addressed.*

Sheet 8

12N. Relocate the fire hydrant. Start 600' reconfigure from the fire hydrant called out on the redlines.

Response: *Existing Fire Hydrant is on the west side of S Little River St, see snip. So, we begin the fire hydrant on the east side, as shown, to continue the alternating configuration.*

Sheet 11

12O. Identify and label fire lane easements, and fire lane signs.

Response: *Addressed.*

12P. A 100' fire lane easement is required in alleys V, W, and X.

Response: *Addressed.*

12Q. Signage at the entrance to a dead end. Can be faced 90 degrees to the roadway.

Response: *Addressed.*

12R. Signage at the end of the fire lane easement.

Response: *Addressed.*

13. Aurora Water (Cliff Stephen | 303-739-7490 | cstephen@auroragov.org)

Site Plan Comments

Sheet 15

13A. These alleys are not public ROW. As such, storm sewer draining the alleys will be private. An easement is not required for the private storm. Tracts containing public water and sanitary sewer need to be dedicated as a utility easement

Response: *Alley configuration has changed slightly with the revised site plan layout. Storm sewer draining the alleys will be private and no easements are shown on resubmittal. Tracts containing public*

water and sanitary sewer have been dedicated in utility easements. Legend and plan have been updated to differentiate between public and private storm pipes/inlets.

13B. This is a private storm sewer.

Response: Legend and plan have been updated to differentiate between public and private storm sewer/inlets.

13C. Note in the plan view says 500'

Response: Addressed. Notes have been updated to reflect plan view.

13D. Also 15"

Response: Addressed. Notes have been updated to reflect plan view.

Sheet 16

13E. Do not see any storm in the location shown.

Response: Addressed. Storm not intended to be there.

13F. Make sure hydrants are fully within ROW on civil drawings.

Response: Addressed. Per the updated site plan layout, all fire hydrants are fully located within public ROW and none are located in alleys.

Sheet 19

13G. Need vehicular access to the top and bottom of the outlet structure.

Response: A maintenance path will be provided to the top of structure at final grading (CD submittal) after outlet structure has been sized.

13H. The pond is private. Provide drainage easement to cover the entirety of the pond.

Response: Verbiage updated to: "Private Detention (Maintained by Metro District)". The Pond tract is already dedicated to be a drainage easement in its entirety. See Sheet 3 for Tract dedications/ownership.

Sheet 22

13J. Provide terminal manhole for sanitary sewer.

Response: Addressed. Terminal manholes added.

Sheet 25.

13J. Temporary access may be required to the sanitary sewer manholes depending on timing of Harvest Rd Improvements.

Response: Addressed. A 10' gravel maintenance access road has been added.

14. PROS (Michelle Teller | 303-739-7437 | mteller@auroragov.org)

Site Plan Comments

Sheet 17

14A. Park grades exceed the slope allowed for fields. Please ensure any fields are under 2% to allow for informal play.

Response: Grades have been adjusted

Sheet 33

14B. Provide some seating for spectators on this side.

Response: Grading in this area will not accommodate spectator seating. Seating has been added along the east side.

Sheet 34

14C. Goals are set very close to homes. Please shift the fields to the south and try to maintain a wider buffer and provide some additional tree groupings here.

Response: The park has been shifted to the south to accommodate more area behind goals.

14D. Provide internal security lighting.

Response: Internal lighting has been provided.

14E. Neighborhood park slopes per the grading plan are too steep to accommodate a field. Please use a max of 2%.

Response: The park grades have been adjusted accordingly.

14F. Provide some shade sails for benches/parents.

Response: A centralized shade structure has been provided. Trees have been adjusted to provide shade as well.

14G. Provide striping for the sidewalk.

Response: Striping for the sidewalk has been provided.

14H. Soccer is continually asked for in Aurora, this will be a well loved and used space. Provide as many shade opportunities for families watching games as possible.

Response: Shading has been provided as much as possible.

Sheet 44

14I. Provide a local trail connection to the south to connect through to the school site as shown in the master plan. This can be an enhanced sidewalk that provides a safe and strong corridor and crosswalks and wider walks at 6' – 8'

Response: A trail connection has been provided along the eastern edge of the site to better align with

Sheet 50

14J. All neighborhood parks are required to provide at least one inclusive element. Please provide and identify the details. Ensure an accessible pathway is provided to the structure.

Response: An inclusive element has been provided along with details.

Sheet 51

14K. Note: pet mesh requirement adjacent to parks and open space.

Response: Noted, pet mesh has been added to the necessary fences.

Sheet 53

14L. Street lights are not sufficient to provide security lighting at a park.

Response: Lighting has been added to the park.

15. **Real Property (Roger Nelson | 720-587-2657 | ronelson@auroragov.org)**

Site Plan Comments

15A. Reference the redlines for a full list of all comments, corrections, questions, and edits.

Response: Comment Responses provided in the red line plan set.

15B. Title the plan set "Site Plan"

Response: Comment noted, title has been changed to "Site Plan".

15C. Make the changes to note 10 per the redlines.

Response: Addressed

15D. The garage cannot be within the 6' gas easement. See the redlines on the lot typicals.

Response: Addressed. Set back from utility easements added to the lot typicals.

15E. Delineate where the gas easement and the utility easement will begin and end.

Response: All utility easements updated to be "UE" (utility easement). Per the revised site plan layout, all easements labeled UE connect.

15F. Label offsite easements.

Response: Addressed.

15G. Label existing ROW widths

Response: Addressed.

15H. Show existing vs proposed ROW.

Response: Existing vs proposed ROW shown and labeled.

15I. Label the adjacent subdivisions with reception numbers.

Response: Adjacent subdivisions labeled with reception numbers.

15J. Label all tracts. There are several instances throughout the plan set.

Response: Addressed. Tract IDs updated to match the final plat.

15K. Label B&Ds/Curve data for the subdivision exterior.

Response: Addressed.

15L. Delineate the existing ROW and the proposed ROW

Response: Addressed. Existing and proposed ROW delineated.

15M. Labeled Tract B on the plat. Make tract labeling consistent between the site plan and plat, typical.

Response: Addressed. Tract IDs updated to match the final plat.

15N. Label Block numbers, typical.

Response: Addressed.

15O. Label the 6' utility easement.

Response: Addressed.

Plat Comments

15P. Please see redlines on plat for comments, questions, corrections.

Response: Please see responses on redlines.

15Q. Provide certificate of taxes due.

Response: Certificate of taxes have been included with this submittal.

16. Xcel Energy

16A. Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the plat and site plan for **Parklands Village 2 Subdivision F1** and has possible conflicts. The utility

easements for the lots within Block 10 are confusing – which side of the lots will natural gas distribution facilities be located? Please note that gas distribution facilities require minimum 6-foot-wide utility easements *within each lot* on the side of the lot that is drivable pavement (minimum 8-foot wide, 6-inches thick) with space for service truck access and plowing in snowy conditions with a minimum 5-foot clearance from any structure.

With that being said, on which side of the lots will the electric distribution facilities be located? If natural gas and electric are within the same easement, 10-feet is required, not to overlap any wet utility easement.

Additionally, 6-foot wide side lot utility easements should be increased to 8-foot wide as these are accommodating the same electric distribution facilities as the 8-foot wide rear lot utility easements. PSCo requests that all tracts are dedicated for utility use for crossing and connectivity purposes.

The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities via xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details

Response: Noted. All dry utility easements have been updated and labeled “UE”. The 5’ minimum clearance from any structure has been incorporated into setback requirements shown in the typical lot layouts on Sheet 4.

17. Mile High Flood District

17A. It should be noted that this Filing lies within the MHFD Sand Creek Watershed and the Northeast Watershed. The comments listed in this review letter pertain to MEP eligible features as part of the Sand Creek Watershed only. A separate comment letter may be issued by the Northeast Watershed as well.

Response: Noted. At the time of this comment response letter, no separate comment letter has been received from the Northeast Watershed.

17B. It should be noted that it was determined in the MDR phase that although Detention Pond H is above the “regional” threshold of 130 acres, it would not be MHFD MEP eligible. Please revise the text in section “Maintenance and Access of Drainage Facilities” of the report to reflect this. Oftentimes, the term “regional” can be construed as MEP eligible and public.

Response: Noted. The “Maintenance and Access of Drainage Facilities” section of the report has been revised to reflect this. Both Ponds H and J are private but will be maintained by the Metro District.

17C. The field observations memo put together by Wright Water Engineers for the outfalls from Ponds G and H state that there is not a concern that these outfalls will cause instabilities in the channel so long as grade control that mimics the current beaver dams in the area is provided. It also notes that since these outfalls discharge to the overbank terrace, it will be necessary to provide a stable flow path across the terrace to the stream. There are a number of existing trees along this floodplain terrace and every opportunity to avoid disturbing them should be considered. These observations should be explored further and documented within this Preliminary Drainage Report.

Response: Addressed. Outfall location updated to avoid trees per WWE field observation memo.

17D. It would be good to supplement the drainage maps with DRCOG contours for areas outside of the project limits, especially in the area of the Pond H outfall to better clarify the existing draw that the outfall intends to utilize.

Response: All PDP sheets have been updated and supplemented with approximately 400' of LIDAR contours around the entire perimeter of the project limits.

17E. The drainage maps seem to indicate that the emergency overflow path for Pond H is onto the proposed roadway before overtopping to Coal Creek to the southwest. Please document this flow path as well as address any stabilization efforts that will be needed along that floodplain terrace for these overflows.

Response: Addressed. Emergency overflow path calculated for Pond H. Calculations included in the PDP. Existing swale stabilized with rip rap. Emergency overflow path contained within a drainage easement.

17F. Please provide a digital copy of the modified MDR CUHP/SWMM models for further review. If preferred, these can be sent directly to MHFD for review and comment before the next submittal.

Response: A zip file containing the updated CUHP & SWMM models was sent directly to MHFD with the comment response letter.

17G. Please ensure an adequate easement is being dedicated for the Pond H outfall and emergency spillway improvements. Any revisions due to the above listed comments should be included in this drainage easement.

Response: Addressed. A Drainage Easement was added to contain the entire Pond H outfall and emergency spillway. Spillway calculations included in the PDR.

17H. Please include the Coal Creek effective floodplain delineation on these documents.

Response: Addressed. The Coal Creek floodplain delineation is included on all sheets where the floodplain delineation is visible (Sheets 2, 3, 11 & 12 of the PDP).

18. Arapahoe County Public Works and Development

Site Plan Comments

Sheet 5

18A. Alameda ROW is depicted as 90'. Actual ROW is 40' with a 60' private tract abutting to the south. Please show correct 40' width.

Response: Delineation updated.

Sheet 7

18B. Show current Alameda Ave. pavement alignment on site plans.

Response: Current Alameda Ave pavement alignment shown on site plans

18C. 40' ROW Alameda Ave. Show on plans.

Response: Delineation updated.

18D. 60' Private Parcel 1977-00-0-00-218. Show on plans.4

Response: Delineation updated.

18E. Any roadway improvements south of section line (south 40' ROW limit) will require ROW acquisition, please coordinate with John Wannigman, jwannigman@arapahoegov.com, Arapahoe County PM for Gun Club-Alameda Improvements Project currently ongoing.

Response: Email sent to John Wannigman and Scott Jardine (SEH inc) on 3/13. Previous coordination had regarding the Gun Club – Alameda Improvement Project was coordinated in November. Ongoing coordination will occur.

TIS Comments

18F. 2030 am/pm TMC's in Fig 12 Total Combined Traffic Volumes don't appear to align with Fig 6 Background Traffic Volumes and Fig. 10 Site Generated Traffic Volumes. Please review and confirm numbers are accurate. It would seem that the Harvest NB 2 LT would be impacted by this number.

Response: *The background and assignment figures previously did not add up to the total traffic volumes because new roadways were being added associated with the project and there would be additional induced volumes based on the new roadway connections; therefore, if the project was not constructed, background volumes would not be at those roads. However, we have included background volumes on roadways that would not be there without the project in the revised study so that total traffic volumes are the sum of assignment and background volumes.*

18G. NEATS projected 2030 ADT of 8,200 on Harvest north of Alameda, 9500 ADT on Harvest south of Alameda, 700 ADT on Alameda west of Harvest, and 7300 ADT on Mississippi west of Harvest along with an assumption that the Coal Creek Bridge would connect Harvest from Alameda to Mississippi. The Parklands Master Traffic Study anticipates 2040 volumes of 4,100 ADT on Alameda west of Harvest and 7,700 east of Harvest.

- Please explain why this study anticipates 15,700 ADT on Alameda west of Harvest, 14,600 on Harvest north of Alameda and 15,700 on Harvest south of Alameda. The increase in ADT on Alameda west of Harvest and proportional distribution of ADT's at the Alameda and Harvest intersection seems incongruent with both reference documents and needs to be better explained, especially in light of both reference studies aligning with the plan to keep this portion of Alameda a 2 lane collector, but this study recommending a 4 lane minor arterial as needed and recommending that a planned 6 lane major arterial on Harvest be downsized to 4 lanes.

Response: *The Coal Creek Bridge will be provided by full buildout of Parklands Village 2 after the Phase 1 2025 horizon shown in this study but before the 2030 full buildout horizon. Trip distribution has been modified to reflect the bridge crossing and due to Alameda Avenue in this segment of roadway being a major collector roadway. The previous submittal of the traffic study also conservatively included Parklands Village 1 and 2 on top of 2030 NEATS volume projections. Volume projections have been reduced to align closer to NEATS volumes. The following larger discrepancies between anticipated 2030 total volumes and those shown in 2030 NEATS and the reasoning behind these differences are described below:*

- 2030 NEATS shows only 700 ADT on Alameda Ave to the west of Harvest Rd and 2000 ADT on Alameda Ave between Harvest Rd and Powhaton Rd. The volume on the roadway today is estimated to be approximately 3900 ADT to the west of Harvest Rd and about 3,200 ADT to the east of Harvest Rd. Even with new roadway connections in the future and Alameda being collector west of Harvest Rd and a minor arterial east of Harvest Rd, it is believed these NEATS estimates are substantially below what will occur in this area. The ADT now estimated on Alameda west of Harvest Rd in 2030 with the addition of Parklands Village 2 traffic is about 4,300 ADT while to the east of Harvest Rd it is estimated to be about 7,000 ADT. Both ADTs are anticipated to be more representative of what will occur in the future, while Alameda as a two-lane collector west of Harvest Rd and minor arterial east of Harvest Rd can easily accommodate these volumes.
- Because of this increased ADT on Alameda near the intersection with Harvest Rd, the ADT on the north leg of Harvest Rd in this study for 2030 background plus project traffic is also slightly higher than that shown in the 2030 NEATS projections. This study shows an estimated approximately 10,600 ADT on the north leg of Harvest Rd while 2030 NEATS showed only 8,200 ADT on Harvest Rd to the north of Alameda Ave.
- Please explain how the background traffic volume on Alameda west of Harvest of 10,500 ADT is determined and specifically what volumes are derived from adjacent development Traffic Studies, such as Harmony east of Powhaton.

Response: Please see previous response.

- Based on Figure 12-2030 Total Traffic Volumes, it appears that for the am peak for the WB Alameda, approximately 63% (420 of the 665) is attributed to thru WB onto Alameda west of Harvest. This seems to assume that the Harvest connection to Mississippi is not complete at this design year. Please clarify
Response: Please see previous response. Northbound dual left turn lanes are not recommended in the revised traffic study. Distribution and volumes onto the west leg of Alameda have been reduced and dual left turn lanes are no longer needed.

18H. Village 2 TIS assumes for design year 2030 that distribution of Parklands volumes will change from 65% to Alameda WB (west of Harvest) in year 2025 to 40% to Alameda WB and 25% WB Mississippi (west of Harvest) as Harvest will be connected to Mississippi. This will require a bridge over Coal Creek.

- Will the development beyond Phase 1 (Village 2) be contingent on this connection and associated bridge? The volumes on Alameda west of Harvest will be significantly affected based on whether the assumption of this connection is constructed and as such the distribution of Parkland traffic with the development of Village2, Phase 2.

Response: The Coal Creek Bridge will be provided by full buildout of Parklands Village 2. Please see previous response for additional clarity.

- The County strongly recommends that development beyond Phase 1 be contingent in some way upon the completion of the Coal Creek bridge and the connection of Harvest to Mississippi. This is based on the fact that traffic volumes generated by this development will eventually overwhelm the capacity of Alameda west of Harvest if the connection to Mississippi, and its use as a second east/west connection to Parklands, is not established.

Response: Please see previous response.

- Additional analysis is needed to demonstrate the impacts to Alameda west of Harvest, specifically to include LOS impacts to roadway capacity, direct access driveways and to the intersection of Alameda and Gun Club Road in their current configuration. This analysis would need to be based on both conditions associated with the Mississippi connection, and associated Coal Creek bridge.

Response: Please see previous response.

- If the overall development is not contingent in some way to the completion of the Mississippi and Harvest connection, and associated Coal Creek Bridge, then the TIS should be updated to include both conditions associated with the completion of the bridge for the build out design year 2030. This is required as currently there is no certainty or obligation of the completion of this bridge which will significantly affect the associated volume distribution to Alameda.

Response: Please see previous response.

18I. The Parklands Village 2 TIS, assumes improvements at Harvest/Alameda in year 2030 will have a NB double LT to Alameda WB. Double LT is not possible with current and potential future plans for Alameda west of Harvest as a 2 lane collector. LOS should be based on single NB LT, consistent with Alameda as a 2 lane collector. Note: Parklands Master Traffic Study assumed only a single NB LT at this intersection

Response: Northbound dual left turn lanes are not recommended in the revised traffic study. Distribution and volumes have been reduced and dual left turn lanes are no longer needed.

18J. Any additional lane improvements as suggested in year 2030 for Alameda EB, west of Harvest, will require ROW acquisition as Alameda ROW is 40' wide west of Harvest.

- Who will be responsible for this ROW acquisition?

Response: It is understood that some additional ROW will likely need to be acquired with signalization of the Alameda Avenue and Harvest Road intersection and the need for an eastbound left turn lane in association with a traffic signal.

- This additional ROW should be dedicated to Arapahoe County
Response: It is understood that additional ROW would be dedicated to Arapahoe County.
- County/COA is currently in progress with the Gun Club-Alameda Improvements conceptual design project which will determine the final alignment/geometry of Alameda west of Harvest. A final recommendation should be determined in spring of 2023. Please coordinate any proposed improvements in this area with AC PM, John Wannigman, jwannigman@arapahoegov.com.
Response: Acknowledged.
- With current Alameda alignment, EB lane shift of approx.. 27' to south would be required over 220' length across intersection with Harvest (includes 75' easement west of harvest ROW). Show on site plans with ROW boundaries and current Alameda road alignment.
Response: This will be shown on the revised site development plan.

18K. Will developer contribute to recommended Alameda/Harvest signalization?

Response: Based on City of Aurora guidelines and pre-app notes, the project would contribute 25 percent towards the future signalization of the Alameda Avenue and Harvest Road intersection.

18L. LOS Results (Table 4) assumes double LT NB lanes at Harvest/Alameda. Please revise based on a single LT as Alameda west of Harvest is planned as 2 lane collector in future (similar with Queue analysis in Table 10).

Response: Please see previous response.

For response to comments, please copy John Wannigman, the County Project Manager for the Gun Club-Alameda Improvements project at jwannigman@arapahoegov.com.

End of Response to Comments