



September 29, 2023

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

RE: Second Submission Review – Sable Blvd. Townhomes – Zoning Map Amendment, Site Plan, and Subdivision Plat

Application Number: DA-2305-00
Case Numbers: 2023-2003-00; 2023-4006-00; 2023-3014-00

KA#: 222010

To Dan Osoba:

We received the Development Review staff comments dated August 31st, 2023. Please see our responses below:

Summary of Key Comments from all Departments:

- Development Review fees are due in the amount of \$32,803.00. Please refer to the invoice sent when the application was accepted. This fee is due at the time of 3rd submittal.

Response: Comment acknowledged.

- This rezone exhibit is typically a survey based on the legal description provided on sheet 1. The boundaries of the rezone shall encompass the legal description area including the 1/2 section of adjacent rights-of-way proposed to be rezoned.

Response: Acknowledged. The rezone exhibit is revised accordingly.

- Staff is concerned regarding the grade change and perception of this development from the adjacent right-of-way in this location. There are three adjustment requests impacting this side of the development:
 - Side setback reduction
 - Green court intervening in open space
 - Retaining wall height

Additional mitigation measures are needed to offset these requests and ensure that the perception of development quality remains the same. It is suggested to provide enhanced side elevations along the development exterior. See notes on the elevation sheets for details.

Response: We are trying to keep a modern look and have chosen to add more material variation on the sides as well as add a taller parapet cap. Horizontal Siding and Brick have been



extended further onto the side elevations, providing a more proportioned and pleasing side elevation for the development.

- Please confirm that this is being coordinated with the northern property owner. This curb is also being shown as proposed on the site plan to the north. An ADA ramp is required in this location.

Response: MULTIPLE attempts to contact the developer and the design team for the project to the north were made since the beginning of the project; however, we have not received any response, or even acknowledgement, from them. We respectfully request that the City Team assist us in coordinating with that team. We continue to show the ADA ramp on the north side of the 21st Avenue, as required; however, it is our position that this ramp is the sole responsibility of that developer. As a side note, in reviewing their Site Plan, which was reviewed by the Planning Commission, they do NOT show this ADA ramp (or the ADA ramp that they would be typically required to install on our side of the road using the “first developer requirement” protocol). There appears to be a design requirement disconnect between what’s being required for that project vis-à-vis what’s being required for the development.

Planning Department Comments:

1a. No questions, comments, or concerns were received from adjacent property owners or registered neighborhood groups during this review. The requirement for the First Review Neighborhood Meeting has been waived.

Response: Acknowledged.

1b. Comments were received from Xcel Energy during this review. Aurora Public Schools comments from the 1st Review have been added as a continued advisory note regarding the school land dedication requirements for this development. Please see the comments from Xcel attached to this letter. Provide a response as necessary in response to the comments letter.

Kephart Response: Acknowledged.

2a. Development Review fees are due in the amount of \$32,803.00. Please refer to the invoice sent when the application was accepted. **This fee is due at the time of 3rd submittal.**

Marco Diaz Response: Comment acknowledged.

2b. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Remove sheets per comments from Civil Engineering and revise this sheet index as applicable.

Response: Acknowledged. Sheets requested to be removed by Engineering were eliminated from the plan set and the sheet index was updated accordingly.

2c. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Provide one, less-detailed overall site plan sheet that shows the full extent of this development.



Response: An overall site plan that shows the full extent of the development, with minimal detail, is now included in the Plat Set.

3a. (Rezone Exhibit) This rezone exhibit is typically a survey based on the legal description provided on sheet 1. The boundaries of the rezone shall encompass the legal description area including the 1/2 section of adjacent rights-of-way proposed to be rezoned.

Response: Acknowledged. The rezone exhibit is revised accordingly.

3b. (LOI) Provide an additional discussion on architectural enhancements provided on the exterior side elevations in the requests for side setback reduction, green court intervening open space, and retaining wall height. See the redlines on the site plan for details.

Response: Additional discussion has been provided in the letter of introduction.

3c. (Subdivision Plat) Please verify that these lot encroachments are acceptable from Fire Life Safety.

Response: Having the 23' fire lane, public access, and sanitary sewer easement encroach into lots (no part of the building) is not atypical. Additionally, Fire Life Safety did not comment on this which implies that they do not find the lot line encroachments problematic.

3d. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Please provide confirmation that Public Works Civil Engineering is amenable to this request.

Response: Public works is amenable to this request.

3e. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Add the Section to these requests: Section 146-4.2.3. A.2 & Section 146-4.2.3.A.4.

Response: The adjustment table has been revised accordingly.

3f. (Site Plan Sheet 2) For all requests: The section should read, "Section 146-.....". For example: the first request should read, "Section 146-4.2.2, Table 4.2-1".

Response: The adjustment table has been revised accordingly.

3g. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Please include the Section text as it appears in the applicable UDO section.

Kephart Response: The adjustment table has been revised accordingly.

3h. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Provide an additional discussion on architectural enhancements provided on the exterior side elevations in the requests for side setback reduction, green court intervening open space, and retaining wall height. See the redlines on the elevation plans for details.

Kephart Response: The adjustment table has been revised accordingly.

3i. (Site Plan Sheet 5) Staff is concerned regarding the grade change and perception of this development from the adjacent right-of-way in this location. There are three adjustment requests impacting this side of the development:

- Side setback reduction
- Green court intervening in open space



□ Retaining wall height

Additional mitigation measures are needed to offset these requests and ensure that the perception of development quality remains the same. It is suggested to provide enhanced side elevations along the development exterior. See notes on the elevation sheets for details.

Response: We are trying to keep a modern look and have chosen to add more material variation on the sides as well as add a taller parapet cap. Horizontal Siding and Brick have been extended further onto the side elevations, providing a more proportioned and pleasing side elevation for the development.

3j. (Site Plan Sheet 8) No action is needed on this item: The activated open space and amenities provided in these green courts are excellent and a good mitigation measure for the adjustment requests.

Response: Acknowledged. Thank you.

3k. (Site Plan Sheet 8) Provide information in this table or elsewhere on this sheet for each green court area. The table should identify the total area of the green court and the percentage of that area that is usable open space or amenitized. This would include the half-green court on the east side of the development.

Response: A “Green Court Calculations” table is now included 8 that provides this information.

3l. (Site Plan Sheet 8) The comment response does not indicate if this half-green court is 50% open to comply with green court requirements. The 50% should be truly "open" and unencumbered by sidewalks and trees as feasible. If the area is not 50%, an adjustment will be required.

Response: See response to 3k, above. Further, based on Green Court requirements, trees can be within open/active areas.

3m. (Site Plan Sheet 8) Ensure to call out the social gathering area between buildings B6 and A6. Identify amenities in this space.

Response: The planned amenities (e.g. “Social Gathering” areas) are now noted and called out.

4a. Streets and pedestrian comments have been addressed.

Response: Acknowledged.

5a. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Clarify that these are surface guest parking spaces.

Response: Correct, these are surface guest parking spaces that the language is updated to reflect such.

5b. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Accessible space requirements are only for non-residential and commercial land uses. Please change the requirement to 0.

Response: Acknowledged. Requirement value is updated to show “0” (zero).

6a. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Vinyl is not a permitted fencing material. Update this keynote and provide a detail of the fence that utilizes a permitted material.



Response: Development would like to use Bianco 68.9”Hx70.9”W Composite Wood Fencing in the color black, to accent the black brick color on the buildings. See 5/18&19

6b. (Site Plan Sheet 3) A detail of this pedestrian railing is needed. Provide a detail showing the dimensions and construction materials to be used.

Response: 2” powder coated metal frame at sides (4’ o.c.) and top, with 1/4” powder coated flat bar horizontal balusters. See 5/18&19.

6c. (Site Plan Sheet 7) Amenities placed in the green court areas need to have a detail. Please provide details of the amenity features that include general dimensions and finishes.

Response: Details for the planned amenities, including general dimensions, colors, and finishes, are now provided on “Landscape Details #3.”

6d. (Site Plan Sheet 7) Label the total height of the combined retaining wall including the sloped separation. If it varies, list the maximum.

Response: The overall height of the combined retaining wall varies through the project so the maximum overall height is provided. This is addressed by the Site Civil Engineer.

6e. (Site Plan Sheet 18-19) Suggestions regarding side elevation enhancements per the adjustment requests for side setback, green court standards, and retaining wall height:

- If there is an opportunity to place windows on the 2nd elevation, please do so.
- Low-level building-mounted light fixtures for human-scale design.
- Window shutters and/or mullions
- Enhanced roof fascia. Width or design that is more than just a metal band.

Staff is willing to discuss the design of this further and workshop ideas to meet adjustment criteria. This item would need to be addressed prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission in order to have staff support for the requests.

Response: The developer has reviewed the suggestions and responses as follows. We looked at opportunities for side windows and based on the program and floor plan layout any additional window location on the 2nd level did not help the aesthetic of the side elevation. Lighting on the sides of the buildings would be part of the landscape package, if included at all. We are going for a modern look and therefore shutters do not fit that design language. We did make the metal parapet cap taller on the EF3 Exterior Material to help define the top profile of the wall.

7a. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Add a section for "Proposed Signage". If this is not known at this time, please indicate "To be determined under a separate permit". Please note that if any monument signs are proposed, the location must be shown on the site plan with dimensions from adjacent walks and a detail of the sign must be if show the sign dimensions and construction materials. If signage is provided under a separate permit, an amendment to this site plan will be required to incorporate the monument sign.

Response: Acknowledged. Signage will be sought under a separate permit and the note is updated accordingly.



8a. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Please clarify the widths of the curbside landscaping, as the site plan has one at 7.5' and two at 8'. However, the landscape plans have them all at 7.5'. As such, please recheck and have the landscape plans and the site plans concur.

Response: The widths of the curbside landscaping is coordinated between the Site Plan and the Landscaping Plan to be consistent.

8b. (Site Plan Sheet 6) Please clarify the proposed DE (E-3) on the civil pans in the green court, as it appears that some proposed trees are within them on the landscape plans. As such, please obtain approval from the City to allow any trees in the DE of the green courts on the landscape plans. (TYPICAL on all green courts).

Response: The design of the stormwater management system is different than what was previously shown. The current design includes affords us the ability to provide easements that do not adversely impact the planned landscaping.

8c. (Site Plan Sheet 7) Please provide the fence detail.

Response: A pedestrian railing, and fence detail, is now included on this Site Plan sheet.

8d. (Site Plan Sheet 9) Please correct the proposed quantities for the COA trees from 16 to 13 on all the plant lists.

Response: The quantities for COA Trees within the Plant Schedule table is adjusted to reflect 13 trees being provided.

8e. (Site Plan Sheet 10) Please provide a detail of the proposed fence.

Response: This detail is included on Site Plan Sheet 7. Site Plan Sheet 10 is one of the Landscape Plans and this detail isn't appropriate on that sheet.

8f. (Site Plan Sheet 11) Please clarify the widths of the curbside landscaping, as the site plan has one at 7.5' and two at 8'. However, the landscape plans have them all at 7.5'. As such, please recheck and have the landscape plans and the site plans concur.

ESC/Julio Response: The widths of the curbside landscaping were coordinated with the Site Civil Engineer's design and what is now shown is consistent between the plans.

9a. Addressing comments have been addressed.

Response: Acknowledged.

Civil Engineering Comments:

10a. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Remove the cross pan. If a cross pan is appropriate here, it will be reviewed/approved as part of the civil plans. Cross pans are not permitted on streets with storm sewers.

Response: This is an incorrect interpretation of §4.03.2 of the City's 2023 Roadway Design Manual. The intent of this section is to forbid the installation of cross pans ACROSS roadways that include storm sewer system, not along the flowline of the major street at intersections with other streets (or



in our case, or private access drives). As such, the cross pans are appropriate and continue to be shown on the Site Plan.

10b. (Site Plan Sheet 3) S9.4 is a midblock crossing ramp. Please remove the reference to the detail. The ramp details will be reviewed/approved as part of the civil plans.

Response: Acknowledged. The callout is updated accordingly.

10c. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Remove reference to wood. Railing material/type will be reviewed/approved as part of the civil plans.

Response: Acknowledged. The callout is updated accordingly.

10d. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Please confirm that this is being coordinated with the northern property owner. This curb is also being shown as proposed on the site plan to the north. An ADA ramp is required in this location.

Response: MULTIPLE attempts to contact the developer and the design team for the project to the north were made since the beginning of the project; however, we have not received any response, or even acknowledgement, from them. We respectfully request that the City Team assist us in coordinating with that team.

We continue to show the ADA ramp on the north side of the 21st Avenue, as required; however, it is our position that this ramp is the sole responsibility of that developer.

As a side note, in reviewing their Site Plan, which was reviewed by the Planning Commission, they do NOT show this ADA ramp (or the ADA ramp that they would be typically required to install on our side of the road using the “first developer requirement” protocol), as noted in the comment. There appears to be a design requirement disconnect between what’s being required for that project vis-à-vis what’s being required for the development.

10e. (Site Plan Sheet 4) For simplicity, please remove the cross pans from the site plan. If a cross pan is appropriate here, it will be reviewed/approved as part of the civil plans.

Response: The linework reflecting the necessary crosspans is critical to the overall presentation of the Site Plan. We acknowledge that this element is reviewed/approved as part of the civil plans; however, the linework continues to be shown.

10f. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Please show the full connection to the existing pavement.

Response: The linework for the complete taper of proposed pavement to the existing edge of pavement on the east end of Montview Boulevard is shown.

10g. (Site Plan Sheet 7) For each street, identify the following information as part of the site plan submittal in conformance with Section 2.12.0.1 of the Roadway Manual:

- Roadway Classification (typical section name)
- Adjacent Land Use Category, as applicable
- Number of lanes
- Back-to-back curb width



- Pedestrian Activity Level
- Pavement Type: R3, for all lighting calculations

This information (if it's not already shown) can be added to the street sections provided if desired. This was a comment on the photometric sheet on the last submittal and the comment response indicated that it was added but it is not clear to me where it was added.

Response: The information noted above, where applicable (and with the exception of Pedestrian Actively Level), is included on the Typical Street Cross Sections. We require additional guidance on WHICH Pedestrian Activity Level the City is expecting us to design to based on §4.10.4.04.01 of the Roadway Design & Technical Criteria. We expect this to be considered “LOW;” which is defined as “generally used in...single family residential, and rural or semi-rural areas.” PLEASE CONFIRM.

10h. (Site Plan Sheet 15) SL-1

Response: The Street Lighting Photometrics Plan is revised accordingly.

10i. (Site Plan Sheet 16) Remove COA details from the site plan.

Response: Former Sheet 16, “Site Lighting Fixtures” is removed from the Site Plan set.

10j. (Site Plan Sheet 16) For simplicity, please remove the fixture type and pole type for the public streetlights from the site plan. The fixture type and pole type will be approved on the civil plans. Simply identifying the streetlights as SL-1 and SL-3 will be adequate for approval on the site plan.

Response: Since all of the information shown on (former) Sheet 16, “Site Lighting Fixtures” was stricken in the comments, the plan sheet, as noted above, is removed from the Site Plan set.

10k. (Site Plan Sheet 17) For simplicity, please remove the fixture type and pole type for the public streetlights from the site plan. The fixture type and pole type will be approved on the civil plans. Simply identifying the streetlights as SL-1 and SL-3 will be adequate for approval on the site plan.

Response: Former Sheet 17, “Site Lighting Fixtures” is removed from the Site Plan set.

Civil Engineering Comments:

11a. (TIS) 2023-08-21 (DJK) The updated 8 hr warrant investigation is good, Sable & Montview will need signalization by 2040.

Two minor comments, need an updated Site Plan per site plan process currently under review, and need to provide Delay values with all turning movement LOSs provided in tables.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study is updated to include an updated Site Plan.

11b. (TIS) The Site Plan provided in AMANDA does not match this version. Western most accesses do not exist.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study is updated to include an updated Site Plan.

11c. (TIS) A clip from the updated Site Plan has been added to the redlines.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study is updated to include an updated Site Plan.



11d. (TIS) Add Delay (sec/veh) to each LOS.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study is updated to include Delay (sec/veh) to each LOS.

11e. (TIS) Add Delay (sec/veh) to each movement LOS.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study is updated to include Delay (sec/veh) to each movement LOS.

11f. (TIS) Add Delay (sec/veh) to each movement LOS.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study is updated to include Delay (sec/veh) to each movement LOS.

11g. (TIS) Provide Delay (sev/veh) for these LOS movements.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study is updated to include Delay (sev/veh) to the LOS movements.

11g. (TIS) Provide Delay (sev/veh) for these LOS movements.

Response: The Traffic Impact Study is updated to include Delay (sev/veh) to the LOS movements.

11h. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Need to add a note:

UTAH DEVELOPMENT GROUP, 324 S 400 W, SUITE 175 SALT LAKE CITY, UT, 84101, (801) 641-8956, SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PAYMENT OF 25% OF THE TRAFFIC SIGNALIZATION COSTS FOR THE INTERSECTION OF SABLE BOULEVARD & MONTVIEW BOULEVARD, IF AND WHEN TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS ARE SATISFIED. TRAFFIC SIGNAL WARRANTS TO CONSIDER SHALL BE AS DESCRIBED IN THE MOST RECENTLY ADOPTED VERSION OF THE MANUAL ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES, AS OF THE DATE OR DATES OF ANY SUCH WARRANT STUDIES. FOR WARRANT PURPOSES, THE MINOR STREET APPROACH TRAFFIC SHALL TYPICALLY BE COMPRISED OF ALL THROUGH AND LEFT-TURN MOVEMENT AND 50% OF RIGHT-TURN MOVEMENTS UNLESS OTHERWISE DETERMINED BY THE TRAFFIC ENGINEER. PURSUANT TO 147-37.5 OF THE CITY CODE, THE PERCENTAGE OF

THE TRAFFIC SIGNALIZATION COSTS IDENTIFIED ABOVE SHALL BE PAID TO THE CITY BY THE APPLICANT / OWNER, TO BE HELD IN ESCROW FOR SUCH PURPOSE, PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT FOR THE RELATED DEVELOPMENT OR AS OTHERWISE REQUIRED BY CITY CODE. THE PERCENTAGE ABOVE WILL BE APPLIED TO THE ENTIRE TRAFFIC SIGNALIZATION COST AS ESTIMATED AT THE TIME OF THE ESCROW DEPOSIT TO CALCULATE THE SPECIFIC DOLLAR FUNDING REQUIREMENT.

Response: Comment Acknowledged. Note has been added.

11i. (Site Plan Sheet 3) New STOP sign needed with street name signs.

Response: The call out for the planned new STOP sign is updated to note “with street names.”

Fire & Life Safety Comments:

12a. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Where an accessible route crosses a drive-aisle provide curb ramps and a crosswalk.

Response: Curb ramps have always been proposed in these areas; however, the striped crosswalk is now provided at all drive aisles entering into the property.



12b. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Will there be a mail kiosk amenity? If so, please provide an accessible route to the mail kiosks and details. Within this detail show the adjacent street, vertical/mountable curb, curb ramp from street to sidewalk, and width of sidewalk. The detail shall convey information that demonstrates compliance with ADA and Postal regulations that includes units of measurement and scales, and cross referencing.

Response: The Site Plan provides for a basic postal central box unit (key note 6.16, as previously shown), which is typical for residential. It is located off the public walk and close to two ADA ramps. A route is now depicted for clarity.

12c. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Show a crosswalk at all drive aisles entering into the property (TYP).

Response: Reference response to 12a, above.

12d. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Using a heavy dashed delineation and label show the exterior accessible route of travel throughout the site plan to:

Provide an accessible route to all on-site amenities. These elements can include, but are not limited to; tennis courts, clubhouses, pools, laundry facilities, mail kiosks, and dumpsters. Provide marked crosswalks in all areas where the accessible route crosses a drive aisle.

Response: We have made changes to the amenities on the site plan to make sure that all residents (including those with disabilities) have access to the same type of amenities.

12e. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Where an accessible route crosses a drive-aisle provide curb ramps and a crosswalk.

Response: Reference response to 12a, above.

12f. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Show a crosswalk at all drive aisles entering the property (TYP).

Response: Reference response to ¶12a, above.

Aurora Water:

13a. (Site Plan Sheet 1) The site plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.

Response: Acknowledged.

13b. (Site Plan Sheet 5) Banked meter pits shall be housed in a vault -- current design may not be able to accommodate the vault. There are several instances of this comment; please see the redlines for details.

Acknowledged; however, the City’s detail, although it references a possible need of a vault, it does not state or detail the size of the vault. Regardless, the banked meters for the western most units will take their service from the existing water main within Sable Boulevard vis-à-vis E 21st Avenue or Montview Avenue.

13c. (Site Plan Sheet 5) The water service lateral seems to be misplaced.

Response: No longer relevant. The connection is relocated to the water main with Sable Boulevard.



13d. (Site Plan Sheet 5) All inlets in ROW shall be designated as public (TYP).

Response: Acknowledged.

13e. (Site Plan Sheet 5) FFEs shall be at least 1 ft above the 100-yr WSEL. Please show the 100-yr WSEL to verify that this requirement has been met. (TYP).

Response: This information will be shown on the Preliminary and Final Drainage Maps and is not relevant for these plan sheets. Further, stormwater detention is provided below grade and the water quality and 100-yr WSEL will be fully contained with the underground system.

13f. (Site Plan Sheet 5) Advisory for the coming Civil Plan review:

Show a pothole log for all connections to existing water and sanitary mains and for all utility crossings. Ensure minimum utility crossing clearances are met.

Response: Acknowledged. No changes to the Site Plan are necessary in addressing this comment.

13g. (Site Plan Sheet 5) Is this supposed to be a chase drain?

Response: The design now includes a chase drain in the areas questioned.

13h. (Site Plan Sheet 10) No plantings within 5 ft of water meters.

Response: Acknowledged. The landscaping plan and the utility plan are coordinated to ensure separation.

Forestry Comments:

14a. Forestry comments have been resolved.

Response: Acknowledged.

PROS:

15a. Advisory Comment (No action needed at this time): General comments from PROS regarding updated 2023 land dedication and development fees are included below. As a reminder, cash-in-lieu of land dedication is due prior to plat approval and recording, and park development fees are due per unit at the time of building permit issuance.

Kephart Response: Acknowledged.

15b. Cash-in-lieu of Land Dedication

- 70 units x 2.65 persons per single-family household = 186 persons. At the rate of 3.0 acres per 1,000 residents for the neighborhood park, and 1.1 acres per 1,000 residents for the community park, the land dedication requirement is a total of 0.76 acres (0.56 and 0.20 acres respectively). Being infill development, this project is exempt from open space dedication requirements and can also take advantage of the City's less-than-market-rate per acre value for land of \$62,000 per acre.
- The resultant cash-in-lieu payment for land dedication will be 0.56 acres x \$62,000 per acre = \$47,120.



Kephart Response: Acknowledged.

15c. Park Development Fees - The 2023 per unit fee for single-family residential is \$2,128.58 for a total of \$149,000.60.

Response: Acknowledged.

Land Development Services

16a. See the Advisory Comments on the first page of the plat.

Response: Acknowledged.

16b. Add the Key Maps on the graphic pages. See other comments on the plat.

Response: A Key Map is now included on both graphics pages. Distance to lot corner dimensions are not included on the graphics pages. Having the 23' fire lane, public access, and sanitary sewer easement encroach into lots (no part of the building) is not atypical. Additionally, Fire Life Safety did not comment on this which implies that they do not find the lot line encroachments problematic.

16c. On the site plan: change the Lot lines to be solid lines.

Response: For clarity, this request was not done. Instead, the specific line type delineating the lot lines is shown in the LEGEND. The lot lines on the plat, however, are show as solid lines, as required.

Revenue

17a. Advisory Note: Storm Drain Development Fee due: 4.4-acres x \$1,242.00 = \$5,464.80.

Response: Acknowledged.

Aurora Public Schools

18a. Continued Advisory Note: In accordance with Section 4.3.18 of the Unified Development Ordinance, the school land dedication obligation for the 70 townhome units is .4603 acres. The proposed development will replace one residential unit previously located in the development area. The difference between the school land obligation for the current development and what would be required based on the one unit the project is replacing is .4439 acres. Aurora Public Schools will accept cash-in-lieu of land for the .4439-acre obligation valued at the market value of zoned land with infrastructure in place. Cash-in-lieu is due prior to plat approval.

Kephart Response: Acknowledged.

18b. See the student yield table from the first review letter for details.

Kephart Response: Acknowledged.



Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns, or if you require additional information regarding our submittal.

Sincerely,

Jeff Neulieb

KEPHART