

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



December 19, 2023

Jerry Richmond  
Integrity Land Ventures, LLC  
7200 S Alton Way  
Centennial, CO 80112

**Re: Third Submission Review – Foundry Site Plan No 1 – Site Plan and Plat**  
Application Number: **DA-2315-01**  
Case Numbers: **2023-4010-00; 2023-3031-00**

Dear Mr. Richmond:

Thank you for your third submission, which we started to process on December 12<sup>th</sup>, 2023. We have reviewed your plans and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments and community members.

Since several important issues remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before January 9<sup>th</sup>, 2024. As there are a significant number of remaining comments, particularly from Public Works Civil Engineering, please coordinate a review comments meeting with your team, planning, and civil engineering by contacting your ODA representative (Justin Andrews).

Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a cover letter specifically responding to each item. The Planning Department reserves the right to reject any resubmissions that fail to address these items. If you have made any other changes to your documents other than those requested, be sure to also specifically list them in your letter.

Your estimated Administrative Decision date is tentatively set for February 14<sup>th</sup>, 2024. Please remember that all abutter notices for decisions 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.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at 303-739-7132 or [egates@auroragov.org](mailto:egates@auroragov.org).

Sincerely,

Erik Gates, Planner II  
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Eva Mather, Norris Design  
Tonya Swartzendruber, Norris Design  
Justin Andrews, ODA  
Filed: K:\\$DA\2315-00rev3



## *Third Submission Review*

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

- Per discussions with planning staff, both adjustments may be removed from this application. Small lot tracking will need to be maintained across Neighborhood 1 and Neighborhood 3. [Planning]
- Provide the water/sewer connections and all easements on the planting plans. [Landscaping]
- The Kewaunee St sections either need to match the approved master plan or the master plan for Harvest Crossing needs to be amended. [Civil Engineering]
- An ISP for Jewell Ave has yet to be submitted. If it is not submitted, this site plan is expected to show the interim and ultimate conditions and necessary transitions for Jewell Avenue. [Civil Engineering]
- Need to better delineate interim condition and tie in along Warren. [Traffic Engineering]
- More detail is needed on the Fire Lane easement for the small lot private alleys. [Fire/Life Safety]
- The site plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the preliminary drainage report is approved. [Aurora Water]
- The size of tract BX is not consistent with the Foundry Master Plan. If the reduced tract size of 9.95 acres remains, additional neighborhood park land may need to be provided elsewhere in the development to make up the difference. [PROS]
- Various labeling and recording information is needed for Real Property. [Real Property]

### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

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

- 1B. There were no questions, comments, or concerns received from abutting property owners or registered neighborhood groups that were notified of this application.

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

[Letter of Intent Page 4]

- 2A. It was planning staff's understanding that an agreement had been reached to meet the small lot maximum numbers by counting all lots in Neighborhood 1 and Neighborhood 3 (as defined in the Foundry Master Plan) together. As no site plan for Neighborhood 3 has been submitted yet, an adjustment for maximum small lots is not needed at this time. However, please make a note of this agreed methodology in the site plan and plan to accommodate the balance of small lots within the future site plan for Neighborhood 3.

[Letter of Intent Page 5]

- 2B. As the entry monument sign at the size shown was approved through the Foundry Master Plan, no adjustment is needed for the sign on this site plan application. This adjustment section can be removed.

[Site Plan Page 1]

- 2C. Per the comments left in the Letter of Intent, neither of these adjustments appear to be needed. Please revise the Letter of Intent to remove the major adjustment requests.
- 2D. Please remove the implementation plan from the amendments block and locate it elsewhere.

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

[Site Plan Page 2]

- 3A. The percentages in the lot tracking table should be based on the total lots in the site plan, not based on the number of small lots or standard lots separately. Splitting this table between standard lot and small lot types however is good and should be maintained in the next submission.



Housing Type		
	Site Plan No. 1	
	Small Lot Product Types Amount Provided Per Site Plan	Percentage of Small Lot Product Type Provided Per Site Plan
<b>Small Lots</b>		
Paired Home	76	31%
Paired Home Green Court	64	26%
32' Min Frontage	55	22%
32' Min Frontage Green Court	27	11%
45' Min Frontage	24	10%
Small Lot Subtotal	246	
	Standard Lot Product Types Amount Provided Per Site Plan	Percentage of Standard Lot Product Type Provided Per Site Plan
<b>Standard Lots</b>		
Townhome	26	12%
Townhome Green Court	15	7%
50' Min Frontage	114	54%
60' Min Frontage	57	27%
Standard Lot Subtotal	212	
<b>Multi-Family</b>		
Multi-Family	0	0%
<b>Total Per Site Plan</b>	458	

- 3B. Staff has agreed to track small lot numbers across both this Neighborhood 1 and Neighborhood 3 (as defined in the Foundry Master Plan). Future site plan submittals that include residential units in both neighborhoods will need to include this table and all other previous housing lot tracking tables. It is expected that the final site plan for these neighborhoods demonstrates that 50% or less of all lots are small lots. Please include a footnote under this table stating that small lots will be tracked and evaluated across these two neighborhoods as future site plans are submitted.

#### **4. Access and Connectivity Comments**

[Site Plan Page 46]

- 4A. It appears that E Warren Ave should also be included as a Public Collector St.

#### **5. Parking Comments**

- 5A. There were no more parking comments on this review.

#### **6. Urban Design Comments**

- 6A. Urban design comments have been addressed.

#### **7. Signage & Lighting Comments**

[Site Plan Page 1]

- 7A. Signage standards have been adjusted and approved through the master plan, so reference the master plan as well for the maximum signage area. Also include the proposed signage as it is included in this application.

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

[Site Plan Page 96 & 97]

- 8A. For all typicals: provide the water/sewer connections and all easements on the planting plans.

### **REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

#### **9. Civil Engineering** (Kendra Hanagami / 303-739-7295 / [khanagam@auroragov.org](mailto:khanagam@auroragov.org) / Comments in green)

[Site Plan Page 1]

- 9A. New comment based on new information/Repeat Comment: Coordination is required with Harvest Crossing to determine if the proposed typical section will be accepted. Please ensure Harvest Crossing masterplan amendment (for the 64' vs 70' Kewaunee section) is submitted prior to resubmitting this site plan. The sections either need to match or the master plan for Harvest Crossing needs to be amended. The 64' ROW section was previously approved on the master plan for Harvest Crossing. The comment response indicates that this was coordinated and agreed upon but the wider sections are not represented on the Harvest Crossing master plan. The site plan will not be approved until the Harvest Crossing masterplan amendment is submitted. Also for the Muscadine Way and Caspian Way sections connecting to the roundabout at the intersection of those two streets, please submit the Foundry Masterplan



amendment so those 94' sections are consistent between this site plan that shows 80' sections. Please also update the names to ensure consistency between the masterplan and this site plan.

- 9B. New comment based on new information: Following the 10/25/23 coordination meeting between the City and adjacent developers, as of 12/11/23, we could not find a submitted ISP for Jewell Avenue improvements adjacent to this site. Public Works supports the holistic ISP for Jewell Avenue. But if it is not submitted, this site plan is expected to show the interim and ultimate conditions and necessary transitions for Jewell Avenue. What is the anticipated time line for the Jewell Avenue ISP submittal?

[Site Plan Page 2]

- 9C. New comment based on new information/Repeat Comment: Coordination is required with Harvest Crossing to determine if the proposed typical section will be accepted. Please ensure Harvest Crossing masterplan amendment (for the 64' vs 70' Kewaunee section) is submitted prior to resubmitting this site plan. The sections either need to match or the master plan for Harvest Crossing needs to be amended. The 64' ROW section was previously approved on the master plan for Harvest Crossing. The comment response indicates that this was coordinated and agreed upon but the wider sections are not represented on the Harvest Crossing master plan. The site plan will not be approved until the Harvest Crossing masterplan amendment is submitted. Also for the Muscadine Way and Caspian Way sections connecting to the roundabout at the intersection of those two streets, please submit the Foundry Masterplan amendment so those 94' sections are consistent between this site plan that shows 80' sections. Please also update the names to ensure consistency between the masterplan and this site plan.

- 9D. Please ensure consistency with street naming for E Caspian Way or Ave between submitted documents. (typical)

[Site Plan Page 4]

- 9E. New comment based on new information: Following the 10/25/23 coordination meeting between the City and adjacent developers, as of 12/11/23, we could not find a submitted ISP for Jewell Avenue improvements adjacent to this site. Public Works supports the holistic ISP for Jewell Avenue. But if it is not submitted, this site plan is expected to show the interim and ultimate conditions and necessary transitions for Jewell Avenue. What is the anticipated time line for the Jewell Avenue ISP submittal?

- 9F. New comment based on new information: The ROW sections add up to 157' and do not match the 156' dimension shown in the typical section or the plat. Should this be 54' Prop ROW? (typical)

- 9G. This Asbury Pl. ROW does not match the plat 64' ROW section, or the 67' ROW section shown in the typical sections for Asbury. Please ensure consistency between all sections/labels. (typical)

[Site Plan Page 5]

- 9H. This Asbury Pl ROW does not match the 67' ROW typical section, or the 68.5' plat section shown for Asbury. Please ensure consistency between all sections/labels. (typical)

[Site Plan Page 6]

- 9I. Repeat comment from 2nd Review: E Kewaunee Street needs to match the proposed section in the approved Harvest Crossing plan set. Coordination is required for Harvest Crossing to determine if the proposed typical section will be accepted. Please ensure Harvest Crossing masterplan amendment is submitted prior to resubmitting your site plan. The site plan will not be approved until the masterplan is approved.

- 9J. Repeat Comment from the second Review: Per the PIP, at the intersection with Kewaunee Street and adjacent to PA-5 (proposed school site), this section of E Warren Avenue should be 94' ROW. Further east, it transitions to an 80' ROW. Please update section and ensure consistency with the PIP OR update the PIP and Roundry masterplan submittal to match this site plan, typical all.

[Site Plan Page 7]

- 9K. Please update the plans or plat to be consistent for the width of the sidewalk easement. On the plat I show a 4' sidewalk easement not a 3.5' sidewalk easement. Please update callouts in plans or plat sheets (typ. all)

- 9L. New comment based on new information: Following the 10/25/23 coordination meeting between the City and adjacent developers, as of 12/11/23, we could not find a submitted ISP for Jewell Avenue improvements adjacent to this site. Public Works supports the holistic ISP for Jewell Avenue. But if it is



not submitted, this site plan is expected to show the interim and ultimate conditions and necessary transitions for Jewell Avenue. What is the anticipated time line for the Jewell Avenue ISP submittal?

[Site Plan Page 8]

9M. Should this mountable curb be a vertical curb and gutter to match the typical section? Please ensure consistency. (typical)

[Site Plan Page 10]

9N. New comment based on new information: Please update the plans or plat to be consistent for the width of the sidewalk easement. On the plat I show a 4' sidewalk easement not a 3.5' sidewalk easement. Please update callouts in plans or plat sheets (typical all)

9O. This Iliff Pl ROW does not match the plat 68' ROW section, or the 64' ROW typical section shown for E Iliff Pl. Please ensure consistency between all sections/labels. (typ.)

9P. Should this mountable curb be vertical curb and gutter to match the typical section? Or should E Iliff Pl be an enhanced local street? Please ensure consistency. (typical) Also check sidewalk width. (typical all)

[Site Plan Page 11]

9Q. Repeat comment from 2nd submittal: Per the PIP, at the intersection with E Caspin Ave, this section of S Muscadine Way should be 94' ROW. Further north, it transitions to an 80' ROW. Please update section and ensure consistency with the PIP OR update the PIP and Foundry masterplan submittal to match this site plan, typical all.

9R. Per the PIP, at the intersection with E Caspin Ave, this section of E Caspian Ave should be 94' ROW. Further west, it transitions to an 80' ROW. Please update section and ensure consistency with the PIP OR update the PIP and Foundry masterplan submittal to match this site plan, typical all.

9S. Ensure sidewalk width label is correct. (typical)

[Site Plan Page 16]

9T. As of 12/11/23, we could not find a submitted ISP for Jewell Avenue improvements adjacent to this site. Public Works supports the holistic ISP for Jewell Avenue. But if it is not submitted, this site plan is expected to show the interim and ultimate conditions and necessary transitions for Jewell Avenue. What is the anticipated time line for the Jewell Avenue ISP submittal?

9U. Should this ROW section be 42' and 54' (typical all)?

[Site Plan Page 17]

9V. Should this ROW section be 42' and 54' (typical all)?

[Site Plan Page 18]

9W. Should this ROW section be 54' (typical all)?

9X. Should this ROW section be 156'?

[Site Plan Page 46]

9Y. Repeat comment from 2nd Review: Has this interim section and approved section been coordinated with Harvest Crossing?

9Z. New comment based on new information/Repeat Comment: Coordination is required with Harvest Crossing to determine if the proposed typical section will be accepted. Please ensure Harvest Crossing masterplan amendment (for the 64' vs 76' of 70' Kewaunee section) is submitted prior to resubmitting this site plan. The sections either need to match or the master plan for Harvest Crossing needs to be amended. The 64' ROW section was previously approved on the master plan for Harvest Crossing. The comment response indicates that this was coordinated and agreed upon but the wider sections are not represented on the Harvest Crossing master plan. The site plan will not be approved until the Harvest Crossing masterplan amendment is submitted.

9AA. This ROW section does not match the plat 64' ROW section, or the 69' ROW section shown in the plans for Asbury. Please ensure consistency between all sections/labels. (typical)

9BB. This ROW section does not match the plat 68.5' ROW section, or the 68' ROW section shown in the plans for Asbury. Please ensure consistency between all sections/labels. (typical)

9CC. This ROW section does not match the plat 68' ROW section, or the 69' ROW section shown in the plans for E Iliff Pl. Please ensure consistency between all sections/labels. (typical)

[Site Plan Page 47]





9DD. New comment based on new information: Following the 10/25/23 coordination meeting between the City and adjacent developers, as of 12/11/23, we could not find a submitted ISP for Jewell Avenue improvements adjacent to this site. Public Works supports the holistic ISP for Jewell Avenue. But if it is not submitted, this site plan is expected to show the interim and ultimate conditions and necessary transitions for Jewell Avenue. What is the anticipated time line for the Jewell Avenue ISP submittal?

[Site Plan Pages 77 and 81]

9EE. Please update street labels to match typical sections/plan view (typical all).

[Plat Page 4]

9FF. This ROW section does not match the 67' ROW section shown in the typical section, or the 69' ROW section shown in the plans for Asbury. Please ensure consistency between all sections/labels. (typical)

[Plat Page 6]

9GG. Because the west side ROW is not shown, please confirm that the ROW width here is 80' to match the plans and typical section.

9HH. Should the viewport extend to the sheet 8 and sheet 9 matchlines? It seems like it is cut off here. (typical)

[Plat Page 7]

9II. This does not match the 67' ROW typical section, or the 68' ROW section shown in the plans for Asbury. Please ensure consistency between all sections/labels. (typical)

[Plat Page 8]

9JJ. New comment based on new information: Please update the plans or plat to be consistent for the width of the sidewalk easement. On the plans I show a 3.5' sidewalk easement not a 4' sidewalk easement. Please update callouts in plans or plat sheets (typ. all).

9KK. Because the east side ROW is not shown, please confirm that the ROW width here is 80' to match the plans and typical section.

[Plat Page 12]

9LL. New comment based on new information: Please update the plans or plat to be consistent for the width of the sidewalk easement. On the plans I show a 3.5' sidewalk easement not a 4' sidewalk easement. Please update callouts in plans or plat sheets (typical all).

9MM. Fix labels (remove one of these names) (typical)

[Plat Page 13]

9NN. Repeat Comment from 1st and 2nd reviews: On the site plan this is called out as "E.E" not "U.E." ensure you are consistent with labeling in the site plan, (typical all)

9OO. This does not match the 69' ROW section shown on plans, or the 64' ROW typical section shown for E Iliff Pl. Please ensure consistency between all sections/labels. (typical)

[Plat Page 15]

9PP. Should the viewport extend to the matchlines? It seems like it is cut off here. (typical)

9QQ. Repeat Comment: Coordination is required with Harvest Crossing to determine if the proposed typical section will be accepted. Please ensure Harvest Crossing masterplan amendment (for the 64' vs 76' of 70' Kewaunee section) is submitted prior to resubmitting this site plan. The sections either need to match or the master plan for Harvest Crossing needs to be amended. The 64' ROW section was previously approved on the master plan for Harvest Crossing. The comment response indicates that this was coordinated and agreed upon but the wider sections are not represented on the Harvest Crossing master plan. The site plan will not be approved until the Harvest Crossing masterplan amendment is submitted.

## **10. Traffic Engineering** (Steve Gomez / 303-739-7336 / [segomez@auroragov.org](mailto:segomez@auroragov.org) / Comments in amber)

[Site Plan Overall]

10A. Add taper rates/lengths and storage lengths throughout where indicated on the streets.

[Site Plan Page 4]

10B. Move crosswalk and STOP sign and bar closer to the Jewell/Kewaunee intersection.

10C. Adjust pork chop island at Langdale to positively enforcement right turn only movement.

[Site Plan Page 6]

10D. Need to better delineate interim condition and tie in long Warren.

[Site Plan Page 14]



10E. Sight distance easement required.

[Site Plan Page 16]

10F. Reverse diagonal striping.

10G. Adjust pork chop island at Langdale.

[Site Plan Page 33]

10H. Move crosswalk, sight triangle, STOP bar and sign closer to the Jewell/Kewaunee intersection.

10I. Add street name signs.

10J. Reverse direction of diagonal striping.

10K. Adjust pork chop island at Langdale.

[Site Plan Page 34]

10L. Callout signs along Kewaunee.

10M. Move sign at the Asbury/Little River intersection.

[Site Plan Page 35]

10N. Need to better delineate interim condition along Warren.

[Site Plan Page 36]

10O. Callout all signs, typical.

10P. Add R4-7 sign where Muscadine meets Jewell.

[Site Plan Page 40]

10Q. Add ped crossing signs along Caspian.

10R. Replace sign panel with R3-17 sign along Caspian.

10S. Add W11-2 and W16-7p signs at the roundabout. [2 comments]

[Site Plan Page 41]

10T. Add sight triangle at the future intersection with Jewell.

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

[Site Plan Page 12]

11A. Add fire hydrant at the future Jewell intersection.

[Site plan Page 19]

11B. Add fire hydrant here at the future Jewell intersection.

11C. Dead end hydrant needs calculation. See notes above. Please consult with Aurora Water to make sure they will allow this.

[Site Plan Page 26]

11D. Show proposed fire hydrant here near warren/Iliff.

[Site Plan Page 28]

11E. Add fire hydrant at the future Jewell intersection.

[Site Plan Page 36]

11F. The plat does not show how the fire lane easement begins and ends. Please provide more detail and make sure it is consistent with plat.

[Site Plan Page 39]

11G. Place fire lane signs at blue ovals.

[Site Plan Page 42]

11H. Add wall mounted sign in this greencourt location.

11I. Provide more detail about where fire lane easement begins and ends. Make sure it is consistent with plat.

11J. Fire lane signage may need to be added at this location if the easement extends to the east.

[Site Plan Page 43]

11K. Fire lane signage may need to be added at this location if the easement extends to the east.

[Site Plan Page 45]

11L. All pole-mounted fire lane signs need to be angled.

[Site Plan Page 60]

11M. Add fire hydrant at the future Jewell intersection.

[Plat Page 2]

11N. Tract AI is not a fire lane easement.



[Plat Page 5]

11O. Provide more details on which parts of tract U will be designated as fire lane easement. Make sure it is consistent with the site plans.

[Plat Page 8]

11P. Missing radius along tract BI.

[Plat Page 9]

11Q. Is all of tract BP going to be a fire lane easement? If not, please provide more detail on how the tract will be configured. Reflect all changes on site plan.

[Plat Page 16]

11R. See sheet 9 for fire lane easement question. If these radii in the curve table are part of a fire lane easement, they need to be in compliance.

**12. Aurora Water** (Daniel Pershing / 303-739-7646 / [ddpershi@auroragov.org](mailto:ddpershi@auroragov.org) / Comments in red)

[Site Plan Page 1]

12A. The site plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the preliminary drainage report is approved.

[Site Plan Page 19]

12B. Can waterline be removed from this alley in order for these units to be served from Muscadine and Millbrook? I believe this was discussed at the 11/18 meeting but I'm unsure why this is still providing service from the alley.

[Site Plan Page 32]

12C. Please verify with drainage that this configuration of the concrete access encroaching into the spillway is acceptable.

[Plat Page 2]

12D. For all wet utilities, please revise this verbiage from the generic utility designation to the utility the tract covers (i.e. water easement or water and sanitary easement). Verify the designation matches the plans as some alleys only have sanitary and some have water and sanitary.

[Plat Page 4]

12E. Water easement? For wet utilities, please revise the designation based on the utility is covers.

**13. PROS** (Curtis Bish / 303-739-7131 / [cbish@auroragov.org](mailto:cbish@auroragov.org) / Comments in mauve)

[Site Plan Page 2]

13A. The unit count has changed from the previous submittal, which impacts the total population and the required land dedication. Please update/rectify impacted numbers accordingly.

13B. The park dedication numbers should match between tables.

[Site Plan Page 117]

13C. Is the Bow Solo Swing the specially selected inclusive play feature intended to comply with Section 6.22.B of the PROS Dedication & Development Criteria Manual? Also, inclusive access to the specialty feature should be accommodated through the use of rubber surfacing, not engineered wood fiber.

[Plat Page 11]

13D. The size of tract BX is not consistent with the Foundry Master Plan. The tract in the plan is 10.70 acres, comprised of 2.50 acres for the development's amenity site (clubhouse, pool and parking) and 8.50 acres for neighborhood park use. If the reduced tract size of 9.95 acres remains, additional neighborhood park land may need to be provided elsewhere in the development to make up the difference. The tracking charts in the site plan should be used to ensure enough acreage is dedicated throughout Foundry relative to projected population impact.

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

14A. Numerous minor labeling comments are present throughout the site plan and plat, see these documents for the FULL redlines.

[Site Plan Page 1]

14B. This section on the vicinity map is not included on subdivision Plat?

14C. See comments from subdivision plat regarding the legal description and match.





[Site Plan Page 4]

- 14D. Advisory Comment: Exterior boundary must match the plat and without labeled Bearings & Distances/Curve data comparison is not possible.

[Site Plan Page 14]

- 14E. Plat does not show ROW dedication for the future collection street?

[Plat Page 1]

- 14F. (Advisory Comment) Be advised - sometimes the margins or scale factor may not match the County or City standards as stated in the Subdivision Plat Checklist. If any of these factors are misaligned or scale does not match the drawing information, then this may cause the plat to be sent back and corrected and thus adding time to your submittal. And in turn, you may need to update the Title Commitment to bring it within the 30-day time limit. Please check these items before sending the plat in for recording.
- 14G. (Advisory Comment) Send in the updated Title Commitment to be dated within 30 calendar days of the plat approval date. (This Commitment should be submitted at the time of your final submittal of the electronic Plat for recording.) (Advisory Comment) Send in the Certificate of Taxes Due show they are paid in full up to and through the plat approval date of recording. Obtained from the County Treasurer's office. (This Certificate of Taxes should be submitted at the time of your final submittal of the electronic Plat for recording.) Send in the closure sheet for the description. Send in the State Monument Records for the aliquot corners used in the plat. See the red line comments on the plat and site plan.
- 14H. Label all publicly dedicated roads within 1/2 mile of the site. (See COA 2023 Subdivision Plat Checklist Item #3).
- 14I. Add: "Know all people by these presents that the undersigned warrant (he is, she is, it is, they are) the (owner/s of a parcel of land situated in ... more particularly described as follows:"
- 14J. Add: "Have laid out, platted, and subdivided the same into Lots, Blocks, and Tracts as shown on this plat under the name and style of \*Window Rock Village Center North Subdivision Filing No.1 and by these presents do hereby dedicate to the City of Aurora, Colorado, for the perpetual use of the public, the streets, (and) easements, \*\*and Tracts A and B as shown hereon and not previously dedicated to the public."
- 14K. "A Resubdivision of ..... Tasko Acres Subdivision First Filing and a portion of ...." (Typical)
- 14L. List tracts out as shown on the example. Also delineate which are to be dedicated as "Access, Water, and Fire Lane Easements".
- 14M. Cannot absolve responsibility for conducting a survey?
- 14N. Add: "Non-exclusive sidewalk easements are hereby granted to the City of Aurora for the purpose of maintaining, reconstructing, controlling and using such sidewalks together with the right of ingress and egress, provided the City shall not interfere with any other structures or improvements."  
"All owners of Lots or Tracts adjacent to (insert names of any arterial, collector, and continuous Type 1 local streets here) shall be required to comply with requirements of the Aurora City Code restricting the ability to build a fence along those streets or the types and sizes of fences that can be built along those streets."

[Plat Page 2]

- 14O. Advisory Comment: Move preamble to sheet 1 of 16.
- 14P. Advisory Comment: Move dedication to sheet 1 of 16.
- 14Q. Will the portion of Tasko Acres Subdivision Filing No. 1 be vacated by separate document?

[Plat Page 3]

- 14R. Monument subdivision exterior per COA 2023 Subdivision Plat Checklist Item #13.d.(1) [Typical].
- 14S. Will streets created by Tasko Acres Subdivision 1st Filing be vacated by separate document?
- 14T. VICINITY MAP: Put on Sheet 1. The vicinity map must show the outline of the property being subdivided and its relationship to existing street rights-of-way (with street name labels) within a 1/2 mile. Include a north arrow and distance ratio. If not to scale, add a label stating "NTS". If you have more than 3 sheets of graphic (exclude Sheet 1), create a key map showing what areas of the overall parcel are on which sheets.
- 14U. On the graphic, you must show as-measured angles and distances if they differ from recorded information. [Typical]



[Plat Page 4]

- 14V. Monument boxes with rebar (provide length and size of rebar and cap size) with cap bearing the registration number of the responsible surveyor, to be set after construction is completed per Sec. 147-47 Aurora City Code and per Sec. 38-51-105 (9)(a) & (b) Colorado Revised Statutes 2020. (Typical)

[Plat Page 6]

- 14W. Site Plan shows future collection street? Does ROW need to be dedicated?

[Plat Page 15]

- 14X. Show existing Roads adjacent to subdivision plat (Typical).

**15. Revenue** (Diana Porter / 303-739-7395 / [dsporter@auroragov.org](mailto:dsporter@auroragov.org))

- 15A. Storm Drainage Development fees due 148.5742 acres x \$1,242.00 per acre = \$184,529.16

**16. Aurora Public Schools** (Josh / 303-739-7395 / [dsporter@auroragov.org](mailto:dsporter@auroragov.org))

- 16A. No additional comments from Aurora Public Schools were received during this review.