



Development Review Advisory Board - 7/18/24 Meeting Agenda

Meeting Attendees:

City of Aurora – Jason Batchelor, Laura Perry, Jacob Cox, Cesarina Dancy, Tod Kuntzelman, Scott Berg, Haley Busch Johansen, Brianna Medema, Darren Akrie, Jeannine Rustad, Brandon Cammarata, Aja Tibbs, Sarah Young, Vern Adam, Brooke Bell, Nicole Ankeney

Development Community Representatives – Chris Fellows, David Carro, Bill Parkhill, Dan Green, Michael Kapoor, Layla Rosales, Sarah Kolz

Agenda:

- **Neighborhood plan (previously known as preliminary plat).**
 - o The goal is to eliminate detailed site plans within master plans particularly for large residential filings. These can also be a way to more efficiently document multi-phase sites including commercial pads needing connecting infrastructure without asking for a full detailed master plan or to consolidate duplicative site plan and phased ISP documents for certain contexts. This will help streamline the master plan to civil plan logistics and final plat process for many developers. This will also eliminate the need for a separate ISP process within these parameters.
- **Elimination of preliminary drainage reports:**
 - o This will be applied to most projects where compliance with master documents or City stormwater criteria can be demonstrated through a compliance letter. This will help us find a more streamlined approach across all projects as a result.
- **Consolidation and revision of civil plan timelines inclusive of final drainage reports:**
 - o Looking at the data, this will consolidate timelines for the typical plan set in the 100-200 sheet range. We will then publish all set size timelines for predictability and transparency. We are consolidating the review timeline options based on sheet count numbers from around 12 currently listed in AMANDA to five in the proposed chart.
- **ARTA/Arterial Roadway Civil Only Process Pilot:**
 - o This is in response to ARTA and developers who have complained about the Infrastructure Site Plan process prior to advancing civil plans for regional infrastructure. We've worked collaboratively with AECOM to create a pilot process currently being tested with the ARTA 26th/Aerotropolis DDI project (~270 sheets). We have created a 60% submittal checklist to essentially conduct the prior ISP level review with a single review. The second submittal will follow our standard civil checklist, following the pertinent timeline for full CD approval in one civil portal. This is being tested with ARTA and will be a future option for developer-driven arterial roadway infrastructure.



Office of Development Assistance
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Suite 5200
Aurora, Colorado 80012

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

- **PROS land dedication cash-in-lieu option.**
 - o Proposed concept: Any development type that owes \$10K or more in cash-in-lieu and plats their development between 1/1/2024 and approval of the updated PROS Manual would be eligible to opt in.
- **Additional Items:**
 - o Ongoing staff workshops around cultural review approach for organizational consistency.
 - o Limiting the number of tech reviews post decision/approval on development applications.
 - o Better utilizing technology. We will be exploring how to utilize Bluebeam to help Planning compile DA letters from the referral disciplines, conduct efficient resubmittal checks at all review cycles for QC, and collaborate between departments for technical coordination.

Current civil timelines up to 79 sheets:

Civil Construction Plan Review Timelines Public Works Department

Civil Construction Plans	Up to 39 sheets	40-59 sheets	60-79 **sheets
1 st City Review	15 days	20 days	25 days
Consultant Revisions on 1 st Round	5 days	5 days	5 days
2 nd City Review	10 days	15 days	20 days
Consultant Revisions on 2 nd Round	5 days	5 days	5 days
Final City Review and Approval	5 days	10 days	10 days
Total working days	40 days	55 days	65 days
Total weeks	8 weeks	11 weeks	13 weeks

**Plan sets of 80+ sheets, please contact Engineering Services Division for schedule.



Office of Development Assistance
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Suite 5200
Aurora, Colorado 80012

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

Current civil timelines up to 210 sheets:

Civil Construction Plans	Up to 39 sheets	40-59 sheets	60-79 sheets	80-99 sheets	100-119 sheets	120-139 sheets	140-179 sheets	180-210 sheets **
1st City Review	15 days-3 weeks	20 days-4 weeks	25 days-5 weeks	30 days-6 weeks	35 days-7 weeks	40 days-8 weeks	45 days-9 weeks	50 days-10 weeks
Consultant Revisions on 1st Round	5 days	5 days	5 days	5 days	5 days	5 days	5 days	5 days
2nd City Review	10 days-2 weeks	15 days-3 weeks	20 days-4 weeks	25 days-5 weeks	30 days-6 weeks	35 days-7 weeks	40 days-8 weeks	45 days-9 weeks
Consultant Revisions on 2nd Round	5 days	5 days	5 days	5 days	5 days	5 days	5 days	5 days
Final City Review and Approval	5 days-1 week	10 days-2 weeks	10 days-2 weeks	10 days-2 weeks	10 days-2 weeks	10 days-2 weeks	15 days-3 weeks	20 days-4 weeks
Total working days	40 days	55 days	65 days	75 days	85 days	95 days	105 days	125 days
Total weeks	8 weeks	11 weeks	13 weeks	15 weeks	17 weeks	19 weeks	20 weeks	23 weeks

the 5 days is not required but additional time by the consultant engineer will extend this process

Proposed civil timelines for all projects and set sizes:

Civil Construction Plans	Up to 50 sheets	51-100 sheets	100-200	200-350	350 plus
Initial acceptance	City will complete pre-acceptance check. Incomplete submittals will be rejected.				
Initial Submittal Review	20 days	25 days	35 days	45 days	55 days
Correction acceptance	City will complete pre-acceptance check. Incomplete submittals will be rejected.				
Subsequent Submittal Review	15 days	20 days	25 days	30 days	40 days
Correction acceptance	City will complete pre-acceptance check. Incomplete submittals will be rejected.				
Subsequent Submittal Review	15 days	20 days	25 days	30 days	30 days
Sig set comparison and acceptance	City will complete pre-acceptance check. Incomplete submittals will be rejected.				
Signature Submittal Processing	7 days	7 days	10 days	10 days	10 days

Subsequent Submittal Notes:

Most submittals will require three rounds of review prior to signature set.

*Design Changes will require additional submittals

**Unaddressed comments will require additional submittals

***Any changes to plans identified at the time of signature set will be rejected and submittal process will start over

Neighborhood Plan – Submittal Checklist – Draft

7.16.2024

FELLOWS REQUIREMENTS IN BLUE (07.25.2024)

Pre-Application Meeting (encouraged)

Pre-Submittal Meeting (required)

Cover Page

1. Title

- a. The title shall appear in bold letters across the top of the cover sheet. Including the tract or parcel of which the project is a part, as well as the Section, Township, and Range from the sixth principal meridian, County and State.

OK

- b. If the plan includes any adjustments, include the words "With Adjustments" in the title at the end of the project name.

There should not be any "adjustments" with a "Neighborhood Plan". As it is envisioned (at least by us) to be a non-record document, it would not have "Adjustments". What we would recommend, is that if Adjustments to the UDO, or Rezoning, or Master Plan Amendments are needed in order for the Subdivision Plat to be fully in compliance, then this could be a place to identify, or list, those matters, but again, that should not have to be resolved for the Neighborhood Plan to move forward.

- c. If the project is part of an existing development or master plan, the name of the existing development shall appear in the title. For example, "Target at Buckingham Square".

OK

- d. Do not use the word "Subdivision" or "Filing" as part of a title.

OK

2. Legal Description Block

OK

3. Signature Block

OK

4. Amendment Block

Not sure why a Neighborhood Plan would need to be "amended" as it is (at least in our view) a single neighborhood and is a non-record document, much like a Preliminary Plat, and should not require "Amendment". If a Neighborhood Plan, were for some reason, in need of being "amended, it should happen in the title block and should not need an "Amendment Block"

5. Contacts

- a. List the names, addresses, and phone numbers of the property owner's consulting team.

OK

6. Sheet Index

OK

7. Vicinity Map
 - a. Place a vicinity map of the project site on the cover page in a 3-inch by 4-inch block at a scale that includes the closest major arterial street intersection and all surrounding local & collector streets.

OK

8. Data Block

Depending on what is wanted, probably be fine. What is being asked for?

9. Neighborhood plan must include all contiguous property in common ownership (if the parcels are previously unplatted)

Why? This can be done but why? It has nothing to do with the "context" of street and lot layout in the Neighborhood Plan. Let's not clutter the Neighborhood Plan with so much unnecessary information that it becomes an ISP/Site Plan by a different name.

All property owners within the depicted plan boundary must be signatories on the plan application and provide a letter of authorization

OK, but again, why? I understand that for a record proceeding this is vital, but this is supposed to be like a Preliminary Plat – it is a non-record document. We can do it, but it just more time and detail and effort without real value.

10. Include reference and case number on plan.

OK

11. Notes from "Site Plan Notes"

- a. Include the following additional notes:

- i. At time of Civil Plan submittal, fire hydrants will need to be placed in conformance with the currently adopted fire code.

OK, but again, totally superfluous. That can be shown on the CD's and Subdivision Plat. The Neighborhood Plan does not give any "rights" to build. Plus, you have to follow the currently adopted fire code whether we say so or not. I believe we should be trying to minimize and streamline the Neighborhood Plan ("NP") not keep adding unnecessary information.

- ii. Based on the requirements of the currently adopted fire code, two points of access must be assessed with each phase of the civil plans. This requirement may include additional offsite infrastructure.

Same exact comment as 11a.i. above.

This is the kind of redundancy and superfluous information we are trying to get away from. This is a NP. It is a non-record document. If there are requirements for what is shown on civils (and there are tons) those requirements tell to provide that information with the civils, we do not need to gum up the NP repeating this statement, as it is required irrespective of whether we say it or not.

Key Map

12. Show the entire proposal on a single sheet

OK

13. Show the perimeter conditions, including streets and accesses and drainage corridors, of abutting lands or projects across the street.

With the clarification that this means driveways, accesses, streets and drainage corridors of properties adjacent to the NP area, and not driveways within the NP plan area, then this is OK.

14. Parks, Open space, and trail corridors

We understand that this means to identify, and label, parks, open space and trail corridors, that is fine. But, as it is being asked for on a single sheet, the font may be quite small. We also understand that this does not mean to have "designs" for the parks, trails and open spaces.

15. Pedestrian connections

OK

16. Detention and/or water quality ponds, please include tract boundaries.

OK to show on the vicinity map sheet. Also OK to show general tract boundaries (but not legal descriptions or engineered finite boundaries) for ponds if they are on site of the NP.

If they are "off-site" of the NP then they are almost certainly in the MDR and will be referred to in the FDR, but should not need any more detail than what is shown for things which are on-site and subject to final engineering with civils and FDR.

17. Topographic contours to adequately convey the topography of the site

OK. Assume 2' contours are adequate.

Also assume this means the COA wants it on a separate sheet? It could be shown on the general NP context sheet to save submittal sheets and review fees, but we will assume it is being asked to be on its own separate sheet.

18. Include sheet index and boundaries

OK

19. Abutting Zone Districts - Identify zoning on all abutting properties.

OK

20. Bar Scale and north arrow

OK

21. Show FEMA floodplain or note if not applicable on the map.

OK

22. Section lines

Not sure this serves any useful purpose in terms of a NP layout, but OK. Assume it can be a note on the "context" or main sheet.

Lot Tracking Sheet

Typically, this relates to tracking various small lot requirements to ensure various codified targets are met or, in some cases, targets established in the master plan. Historically we have handled this at the site plan level.

*Another consideration is to look at tracking these items at the master plan level

It is our belief and position that this should be handled at a Master Plan level. Our experience with these kinds of systems is they should be kept with a record document, like the Master Plan. It is really controlled at that level and really should be tracked at that level. Much like tracking density and Density Transfers where those are allowed in municipalities, it needs to be at Master Plan level. We are assuming that is the case here.

Plan Set Pages

In general, the following information should occur on each sheet as opposed to having separate pages for grading, utilities, etc.

Our first submittal did that and much of it was assumed to be missing. We are all for having grading and utilities on one main sheet, but:

That gums up the "context" sheet and it should not be on all sheets or it really creates unnecessary work and reading confusion. We suggest a separate sheet for topography which is what was asked for (are you now asking for grading?).

We suggest a separate sheet for utilities showing plan view and routing of all sanitary sewer, water and storm lines as preliminarily envisioned.

We suggest that a "grading plan" should accompany a SWMP permit request and will be done along with civils but is a bit premature for NP level detail.

23. Location and principal dimensions for all proposed streets and alley rights of way. Identify classifications and anticipated city standards street sections.

Ok. But remember, this is not "hard engineered". Exact road locations may shift a bit as final engineering is completed. General street classifications, street sections, dimensions, ROW"s, etc. can be provided.

24. Location and principal dimensions for all proposed easements (indicate utility, drainage, maintenance access, etc.). Ensure principal dimensions are sufficient and account for adjacent spaces (i.e. maintenance paths) as required.

No. This is too much detail at NP level. Many of these will change when final civil engineering is done. This is a huge amount of time and money, and much of it will get thrown in the waste basket when final engineering is done. This is the kind of detail we are hoping the NP can be completed without. Plus, again, it is a non-record document, why would this be need before civils have even started?

25. Location and dimension of existing easements and rights of ways and identified if they are planned to be removed or changed.

OK

26. Location, schematic layout and volumes for all proposed detention and water quality features (aka: storm control measures (SCMs)), drainage corridor widths including emergency overflow path location and flow direction. Maintenance responsibilities should be indicated in a table format (public/private/MEP).

No. Especially for off-site facilities. Too much detail at the NP level. First, some of this is already in the MDR. Second, it will all be required in the civils and the FDR. Need to get an approved NP, then go to final engineering where all this can be vetted and shown. Again, this would unnecessarily bog down the NP. Things like maintenance responsibilities can be determined during civils and demonstrated with civils and Subdivision Plat.

27. Culvert locations and sizes.

Ok, but only for existing culverts, that will be used by flows passing through the NP, and which are located between the NP (or on the NP) and the next detention pond.

28. Lot Dimensions, Boundaries, and Lot and Block Numbers

General lot dimensions, or lot minimum dimension and lot minimum setbacks OK. Boundary, lot and block information is unnecessary at this level and will almost certainly change, therefore making this request a waste of time and money.

29. Topography (at two-foot intervals or at a greater interval, if prior approval) that show the proposed drainage and road grade conditions including off-site drainage areas tributary to the project boundaries.

Just to be pedantic, this is proposed grading information, not topography. That is ok. We don't want to have to chase tributaries upstream and the downstream information will be contained in the MDR and FDR so we don't want to be creating more work which is not needed for the NP.

Ensure applicant considers freeboard requirements to finish floor elevations or lowest points of entry. Provide Grading Site Plan Notes from "Site Plan Notes".

No, this is way too much detail for a NP. We need to get a NP approved, then move to civils where final grading, final lot dimensions and locations, fine tweaking of streets and road grades are set. Way too early for final floor elevations and "lowest point of entry". This supposed to be a process to set general site layout so we can quickly proceed to civils and Subdivision plat. There is a huge amount of work at final engineering/civils to get road grades, inlets, sanitary sewer inverts, lot grades and other details to mesh. Way too much for NP.

30. Identify land dedication boundaries for public facilities and parks

OK....kind of. Again, we can identify general boundaries and facility types (park, open space, trail, etc.) However, final sizing, exact dimensions and design for those facilities needs to come later. We assume we can put this information on the main "context" page.

31. The date of preparation, graphic scale, and north sign are designated as true north. The top of the sheet should be north, if practicable.

OK

32. Arrows indicate the direction of surface drainage on streets, alleys, drainage ways, and emergency overflow paths.

OK. Another reason why the general drainage sheet/information probably needs to go on a separate sheet.

33. Proposed lots, if any, for multi-family residential uses, business areas, schools, churches and other non-public uses exclusive of single-family residential lots.

OK

34. Proposed zoning & uses for all lots. Draw the zone district boundary line if more than one zone district is present within the project scope.

OK

35. Current zoning and boundaries in the plan and on adjacent sites.

OK

36. The plan must depict non-single-family driveways and streets on the opposite side of existing or planned perimeter streets to ensure alignment, extending at least 100 feet beyond the project.

OK

37. Indicate Neighborhood boundary with heavy/bold line weight

OK

38. Show the preliminary layout and size of water, sanitary, and storm sewer mains. A plan profile is not required with a neighborhood plan; however, a cross section shall be provided for utility intensive corridors to ensure appropriate widths are provided.

OK on the plan view for utilities. As mentioned above, we believe there will need to be a separate sheet for "utilities" information.

No on the cross section. Not at NP level. That work will not have been done yet. That level of detail comes with final engineering and civils. Asking for that now defeats much of the purpose of the NP process.

39. Maintenance access paths as required (considering turning radii and longitudinal and cross slopes when establishing widths and need to access inlets and manholes)

No. That will come with civils and Subdivision Plat. Way too detailed for NP.

40. Show FEMA floodplain and floodway (and panel number/effective date) or note if not applicable on the map. Indicate if modifications (thus a CLOMR/LOMR) are anticipated.

OK

Landscaping

For master-planned projects

41. Include typical for streetscapes, major buffers and medians**, if over UDO requirements, provide table indicating proposal

OK to provide a streetscape and median typical or major buffer typical if not already in the Master Plan. If already in Master Plan, it can be copied or referred to.

42. Include lot typicals relating to front yard landscaping**, if over UDO requirements, provide table indicating proposal

No. First, this is a huge waste of time and money in any event. We have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on these drawings and the related submittal fees. They are always “speculative” as the actual home, home plan, leader walk, drive location and final grading are unknown. So any “typical” is a “cartoon” which does not reflect any real outcome.

Second, at this stage, even the homebuilder is likely to be unknown, let alone home plan, leader walk, driveway location.

Third, this is a non-record drawing. Total waste of time and money at this point. Actually, always a waste of time and money, but totally unnecessary to review the basics of streets/lots/circulation needed at NP level. The zoning, master Plan and UDO already require quantities, no need to guesstimate at NP stage.

43. Include typicals for townhome landscaping**, if over UDO requirements, provide table indicating proposal

Again, too early at NP. Let that come in with civils and landscaping cd's. Plus, by then, the TH builder may be known which would be helpful.

44. Indicate which areas fall under which standards (shading or otherwise defining areas for specific typicals)

Again, that is a bit premature. But if it is really important to the COA to know that at NP level, it can be guessed at.

**Final Design in Civil Set (This option is contingent on pilot projects to evaluate this approach)

Yes. Totally and strongly agree with submitting landscape final design and CD's with civils and suggest they come in with 2nd submittal of civils.

Site plan approval will be required for all lots intended for non-residential development, multifamily, parks, and green courts.

OK

Black Forest/ Tree Mitigation

45. If applicable, it should be addressed here.

OK

Drainage Information

46. Description of overall detention strategy and the criteria and methodologies used to size associated ponds.

NO. That should be in MDR and FDR. If any changes are expected to be needed, it can be mentioned in drainage conformance letter, but the other information is MDR/FDR information. This NP is a non-record plan to show general context of lots/streets/ circulation.

47. Description of water quality strategie(s)

No. That is MDR/FDR information

48. Description of criteria and methodology used for establishing drainageway corridor widths.

No. That will be in civils and FDR.

49. If reliance on offsite, non-master planned storm sewer pipe or drainages, methodology used to ensure adequate capacity

OK. Some discussion of this will be in conformance letter

50. If no drainage master plans exists or conformance with the master plan is not anticipated and the site includes a Regional or Major facility, a drainage kick-off meeting prior to submittal is required.

Does this have to hold up submittal? How about, "must be addressed during NP process and handled in detail in civils, Subdision Plat, and FDR.

Conformance Letters

Conformance letters are appropriate when there is a master report. Often the Master report will be in the Master Plan.

** If there is not a valid master report to demonstrate compliance with, then reports may be required.

Drainage Conformance Letter or report

- Letter will state conformance with Master Drainage Plan/adjacent and roadway Final Drainage Reports. If applicable, should also identify the location of any new facilities since approval of the Master Drainage Report.

OK

Master Utility Conformance Letter or report

- Sanitary and water conformance letter stating that the development complies with the Master Utility Report (including EDN) and most recent city or basin-wide water, wastewater or stormwater master plan.
- An overall "illustrative" utility plan with preliminary sizing will be provided as an attachment to the letter where an approved master plan is not available for reference.

Agreed and as mentioned above we think the utility information should be shown on a separate "Utilities" sheet

Traffic Letter or report

- If the site is in general conformance with the Master Traffic Study, a letter stating conformance is required with the Neighborhood Plan Submittal with Trip generation analysis, traffic volume analysis, and pedestrian connectivity analysis.

OK

- If the traffic volumes are above MTIS, then provide detailed intersection analysis for specific intersections as coordinated with Traffic Engineering.

Above MTIS by how much?

Assuming this request is limited to the impacts caused by the NP and not the overall project. We should discuss it a little further.

If identified by Traffic Engineering during the pre-app, provide Traffic Calming measures per FHWA criteria.

Ok, depending on traffic conformance letter...and maybe this should happen during NP, but before civils.

Land Dedications Conformance Letter

- Letter stating conformance with PROS, School, Fire district needs and other dedication Requirements identified in the approved master Plan

OK

- If the proposal has material deviations **from the approved Master Plan? Or from what?**
 - The letter must include a discussion and diagrams to explain the deviation; and
 - A Master Plan Amendment was submitted to reflect the proposed changes
 - Small Lot/Lot Diversity Compliance Letter **when would this be done?**

OK

- The letter will identify how the proposal is in compliance with all small lots, lot diversity, or other related master plan requirements.

OK

- Submit Master Plan Amendment to update the tracking sheet
This should not be required until Subdivision Plat is approved/recorded or at least not before NP is approved

Public Improvement Plan (PIP) Conformance Letter (if there is a master plan)

- Letter stating which Planning area(s) included in the Neighborhood Plan will identify and how the proposal is in compliance with all required improvements as defined by the PIP, Private streets not built to a public street standard, If any private streets are proposed that deviate from public street standards, then a letter with specification of the proposed deviations must submitted and meet equivalent standards acceptable to the city. Some of the requirements to be considered include engineering standards, fire department needs, landscaping, pedestrian connectivity, and ADA compliance, etc.

OK

Other submittal documents:

Letter of Introduction

OK

Proof of Ownership/ Statement of Authority

OK

Response to pre-application comments

OK

Mineral Rights Notification

No. Totally unnecessary at this step as it is a non-record process.

Avigation Easement (if not completed with the master plan)

No. If it has not happened with Master Plan it should happen with Subdivision Plat. Again, NP is a non-record process

Noise mitigation

No. If needed at all, that can be identified during NP approval and required with civils and Subdivision Plat.

