

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



Worth Discovering • [auroragov.org](http://auroragov.org)

e

November 29, 2023

Tom Clark  
Ventana Capital, Inc.  
9801 E Easter Ave  
Centennial, CO 80112

**Re: Second Submission Review – Parklands Village 1 Site Plan and Plat**  
Application Number: **DA-2289-03**  
Case Numbers: **2023-4015-00; 2023-3035-00**

Dear Mr. Clark:

Thank you for your second submission. 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 December 20, 2023.

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.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at 303-739-7121 or [dosoba@auroragov.org](mailto:dosoba@auroragov.org). You may also reach Deborah Bickmire regarding this project at 303-739-7261 or [dbickmir@auroragov.org](mailto:dbickmir@auroragov.org).

Sincerely,

Dan Osoba, Planner II  
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Layla Rosales, Terracina Design  
Anthony Files, Terracina Design  
Debbie Bickmire  
Brit Vigil, ODA  
Filed: K:\\$DA\2289-03rev2



## Second Submission Review

### PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

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

- 1A. No comments, questions, or concerns were received from adjacent property owners or registered neighborhood organizations during this review.
- 1B. Comments were received from Xcel Energy. Please see the comments attached at the end of this letter. Provide a response to those comments in your next submittal.

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

##### Site Plan Comments

###### *Sheet 1*

- 2A. Remove "MF, & AAC (MU-C)" from the current zoning.
- 2B. Remove unused sections from the data block that do not apply to this application.

###### *Sheet 9*

- 2C. For clarity, please label the roadway classifications on overall maps, typical.

##### Landscape Plan Comments

###### *Generally*

- 2D. Repeat comment: The sheet numbering in the landscape plan set is not correct in the PDF. Several sheets are labeled sheet 18.

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

##### Site Plan Comments

###### *Sheet 1*

- 3A. Provide maximum (38') and proposed building height. Please note that this relates to how wide the green court spaces must be.

###### *Sheet 4*

- 3B. These fences shall not encroach into the green court area. No fences are permitted in the green court space.
- 3C. Based on these typicals and the landscape typicals, it appears that there is no common open space between green court units, and this will all be privately maintained. How will the metro district enforce requirements of green court standards (50% open space, no fences in the green court space, landscaping around the exterior) if these are privately owned and maintained? Staff have concerns about this layout and how it will function once constructed.
- 3D. Green court standards include the use of "common open space" between these units. To comply with UDO requirements, the front setback could be reduced to 10' (5' to the porch) and the remainder should be common open space. Alternatively, an easement maintained by the metro district/HOA could work to maintain the open space area and requirements for the green court.

###### *Sheet 5*

- 3E. Please see the landscape typical for further details on green court requirements.

###### *Sheet 9*

- 3F. Modify as necessary per green court comments.
- 3G. Please add these standards to the lot tracking table or as a note on this sheet for reference: UDO items to keep track of relating to small lot standards:
  - 1. No more than 35% of the lots within Village 1 may be front-loaded small lots.
  - 2. No more than 60% of the total number of lots within Village 1 may be the same type.



3. A minimum of 40% of the lots must meet or exceed the standards for minimum lot width and lot area for single-family detached, standard.
4. A minimum of 10% of the total number of lots must be at least 60' lot frontage and 6,000 s.f.

#### Landscape Plan Comments

##### *Sheet 3*

- 3H. Repeat comment: Tract B landscaping and design will have to comply with green court design standards (50% usable open space, sidewalk connections to each unit, and green court width). Tract B is in a different configuration than the green courts to the south. Please provide landscaping within the tract and a table showing compliance with green court requirements.

##### *Sheet 20*

- 3I. See comments on Sheet 4 of the site plan regarding concerns with the private green court area and maintenance of green court standards.
- 3J. 50% of these green court areas need to be usable in common open space. The sidewalk and landscaping shown in these details inhibit the open space area. Please consolidate sidewalks and landscape areas to comply with these requirements. Provide a calculation table for green court areas that show compliance with the 50% common open space requirement.

#### *Typical, Green Court Requirements*

- 3K. Include the area of the actual green court in these typicals; this needs to be a common area.
- 3L. Ensure that at least 50% of the green court area is landscaped and shall be designed to accommodate foot traffic and play areas. Sidewalks should be located to accommodate pedestrian access while maximizing the use of the green court open space. Trees are allowed but should be located along the perimeter.
- 3M. Call out porch dimensions. The minimum is 45 s.f. and they need to be 5' in the narrowest dimension.
- 3N. Green court area maintenance will need to be addressed. Please add a note(s) relating to how maintenance will be addressed between homeowners and the metro district.

#### **4. Streets and Pedestrian Comments**

##### Site Plan Comments

##### *Sheet 2*

- 4A. Arterial roadways shall have raised medians per direction from internal staff. Please coordinate with PROS and Public Works regarding median design and layout.

##### *Sheet 13*

- 4B. Please see PROS comments for details on trail locations and design and continue to work with them on those issues in the next submittal. It is expected that a trail connection to Coal Creek will be proposed within this development.
- 4C. Please see PROS comments for details on trail locations and design and continue to work with them on those issues in the next submittal. It is expected that a trail connection to Coal Creek will be proposed within this development.

##### *Sheet 15*

- 4D. Sidewalks need to be designed to create usable open space. Sidewalks down the center of the green courts are not acceptable to create these open space areas.

#### Landscape Plan Comments

##### *Sheet 5*

- 4E. Repeat comment: Internal green court sidewalk connections will have to be brought out to Harvest Road.



## **5. Parking Comments**

### **Site Plan Comments**

#### **Sheet 5**

- 5A. Parking areas shall not encroach into the green court common area.

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

### **Site Plan Comments**

#### **Sheet 1**

- 6A. Add "at an arterial/collector entrance".

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

### **Landscape Plan Comments**

#### **Sheet 2**

- 7A. The Harvest Road (East) shrub requirements and tree equivalents should be included in this table.  
7B. The square footage of the area above the 100-year flood plain line along these tracts should be counted toward the planting requirements. If the slopes are excessive in the drainage channel, these trees/shrubs can be located around the detention pond.

#### **Sheet 6**

- 7C. The square footage of the area above the 100-year flood plain line along this tract should be counted toward the planting requirements. If the slopes are excessive in the drainage channel, these trees/shrubs can be located around the detention pond.

#### **Sheet 7**

- 7D. Adjust trees to 50' from the stop sign while keeping as many street trees as possible.  
7E. Trees cannot be placed on corners.  
7F. An additional street tree could be placed here.

#### **Sheet 8**

- 7G. If this group of street trees were adjusted another tree could go to the right of this grouping.  
7H. The square footage of the area above the 100-year flood plain line along this tract should be counted toward the planting requirements. If the slopes are excessive in the drainage channel, these trees/shrubs can be located around the detention pond.

#### **Sheet 9**

- 7I. An additional street tree could be placed here.

#### **Sheet 10**

- 7J. The square footage of the area above the 100-year flood plain line along this tract should be counted toward the planting requirements. If the slopes are excessive in the drainage channel, these trees/shrubs can be located around the detention pond.

#### **Sheet 12**

- 7K. Adjust tree groupings north to maintain street tree numbers.  
7L. The square footage of the area above the 100-year flood plain line along this tract should be counted toward the planting requirements. If the slopes are excessive in the drainage channel, these trees/shrubs can be located around the detention pond.

#### **Sheet 16**

- 7M. Update the street names on Sheet 45 on this plan.



*Sheet 18 (Note there are multiple sheets within the set labeled sheet 18 [sheets 18-22]. Please ensure the page labeling is correct when compiling PDFs)*

- 7N. Update the street names as shown on Sheet 45 on this plan.
- 7O. Update the street names to match sheet 45. Increase font size as the text is not legible.
- 7P. For all typicals: Label or show hatch for the material in these areas.
- 7Q. Is this to be the private open space for these units? If so, please show it like the other typicals.
- 7R. Provide dimensions for U.E. in the driveway.
- 7S. The rear units do not have the same level of planting. Consider shifting the fence to provide some additional planting areas here.
- 7T. 5-gallon ornamental grasses are to be included for the curbside landscape areas.
- 7U. For all typicals, two boulders min. are required for each unit.
- 7V. Label the Tracts

## REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

### **8. Civil Engineering** (Sergio Um / 303-739-7295 / [sum@auroragov.org](mailto:sum@auroragov.org) / Comments in green)

#### Site Plan Comments

##### *Sheet 1*

- 8A. 2nd Submittal  
Comments in green were made by PW Engineering reviewer Sergio Um. Please reach out to him at [sum@auroragov.org](mailto:sum@auroragov.org) for any comments or questions.
- 8B. Note that the lighting sheets will be part of this set, PDFs submitted separately.

##### *Sheet 2*

- 8C. Dimensions from FL to FL add up to 77'. Update dimensions so the total adds up to 78'.

##### *Sheet 8*

- 8D. Delete the extra bullet point.

##### *Sheet 11*

- 8E. Advisory Note: Please coordinate with Kinder Morgan. The plans are showing proposed work on an easement belonging to an outside agency. The city does not send out referrals to these agencies, it is the responsibility of the applicant to coordinate and send plans to them. In the civil plan review, please provide a letter of authorization or email correspondence with the agency showing that coordination is occurring.

##### *Sheet 33*

- 8F. Show slope of alleys (typ.) (minimum 0.5%).
- 8G. Fix text overlap.
- 8H. Fix slopes steeper than 4:1.
- 8I. Add roadway classification label, typical.
- 8J. Show more slopes throughout grading plans. Minimum slopes shall be:
  - 0.5% for concrete surfaces
  - 1.0 for asphalt surfaces
  - 2.0% for landscape/lawns

#### Photometrics Plan Comments

##### *Sheet 2*

- 8K. Add the pedestrian level for these roadways.
- 8L. Public streets shall have public streetlights in conformance with COA standards.

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 (i.e., TOD), 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. ISP is showing information that is not necessary for civil plans. Design and photometrics shall be reviewed in civil plans. The standard note above lists all the necessary items for the ISP.

- 8M. Add a note stating all public lightpole locations are preliminary.

#### *Sheet 3*

- 8O. Sidewalks need to be evaluated for photometrics as well within civil plans (typ.)
- 8P. Add roadway classification labels. Address in civils.
- 8Q. Photometric plans are not to be part of this ISP for public roads, the table from the previous sheet is all that is needed. Photometric plans will be reviewed in the civil plan process, lightpole locations shall be shown on the site plans and grading plans.

#### *Sheet 4*

- 8R. Photometrics are not shown in this gap. Please address in civil plans.

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

#### Traffic Letter Comments

- 9A. 2023-11-02 (DJK)  
Trip balancing previously requested still looks to be an issue. Review of each Filings have issues with the balancing and lack of distribution percentages provided at the outlying intersections to determine the actual generated values at each intersection. Differentials between Filings 1a and 1b are the most significant.
- 9B. REPEAT COMMENT: NEATS indicates Harvest Rd constructed by 2030.
- 9C. Explanation required as to why 'site traffic' for 1b is utilizing intersections 4, 10 & 11, or is that with 1a site traffic? In any account, Figure does not represent Filing 1b well. Update with additional explanation of trip distribution.
- 9D. Filing 2 looks to only show its trip gen/distribution, but AM trip gen numbers do not add up. Update.
- 9E. Filing 3 looks good for trip gen/distribution. Unsure if all values are close.
- 9F. Update to include the trip volumes.
- 9G. Trip gen/distribution adds up for the AM peak.
- 9H. Ensure values are updated and corrected per previous filing comments.

#### Site Plan Comments

#### *Sheet 2*

- 9I. Note, only intersections adjacent to the site are part of the escrow payment necessary for building permit issuance. Per the TIS, Mississippi & Harvest, Louisiana & Harvest, and Flat Rock Trail & Harvest each adjoin this site property for which signal escrow must be collected. Based on the intersections' site geometry, at Mississippi, 25% needs to be collected, at Louisiana 50% needs to be collected and at Flat Rock, 25% needs to be collected. Future site plans for Phases 2 & 4 will deal with the additional Flat Rock & Harvest escrow as well as Harvest & Jewell. Also note, Powhaton & Alameda is not the responsibility of this site or the applicant as the intersection does not adjoin the site property. Revise this note accordingly.



*Sheet 11*

- 9J. Bike lane markings and sign.

*Sheet 13*

- 9K. SHAC requires 45:1 straight taper, otherwise, explain taper rate utilized.  
9L. Bike lane directional markings and signs.

*Sheet 14*

- 9M. Add signs for Authorized vehicles Only.  
9N. Verify intersection is perpendicular  $\pm 5$  degrees.  
9O. Will need to provide crossing enhancements, see the FHWA Guide for Improving Safety at Uncontrolled Crossing Locations when the road is open.

*Sheet 14*

- 9P. Technically will be a mid-block crossing when the roadway is extended to the east in future build-out, need to enhance the trail crossing with PED CROSSING signs and crosswalk markings.

*Sheet 15*

- 9Q. Bike lane directional markings and signs.  
9R. Intersection sight triangles are required.  
9S. How is this going to deter left turns from Wyoming? Need to use port-chop island.

*Sheet 17*

- 9T. Bike lane directional markings and signs.

*Sheet 18*

- 9U. Mid-block trail crossing needs PED CROSSING signage and crosswalk markings.

*Sheet 19*

- 9V. Bike lane directional markings and signs.  
9W. Update the intersection sight triangle locations to the STOP sign location for local street intersections.

*Sheet 20*

- 9X. Intersection sight triangles start from the STOP sign, update all locations accordingly.

*Sheet 23*

- 9Y. Provide directional bike markings and signs.

*Landscape Plan Comments*

*Sheet 3*

- 9Z. Label intersection triangle lines.  
9AA. Relocate the tree.  
9BB. The tree must be 50' from the stop sign. Please see the multiple instances on this sheet.

*Sheet 5*

- 9CC. Revise the intersection sight triangle to start at the STOP sign.

*Sheet 6*

- 9DD. A tree located on the curb and too close to the STOP sign (50' min).  
9EE. A tree is located on the sidewalk.  
9FF. The tree is too close to the STOP sign.





*Sheet 7*

- 9GG. Not correct intersection sight triangle lines, must start from STOP sign, update all accordingly.
- 9HH. Trees in intersection sight triangles.
- 9II. Trees cannot be within 50 of STOP signs. Please see the multiple instances on this sheet.

*Sheet 8*

- 9JJ. Revise intersection sight triangles to start at the STOP sign.

*Sheet 9-11*

- 9KK. Update intersection sight triangles as previously described.

*Sheet 12*

- 9LL. Update intersection sight triangles as previously described.
- 9MM. The tree must be 50' from the stop sign.

**10. Fire / Life Safety** (Erick Bumpass / 303-739-7627/ [ebumpass@auroragov.org](mailto:ebumpass@auroragov.org); / Comments in blue)

**Site Plan Comments**

*Sheet 1*

- 10A. Please correct the code cycle to the 2021 I-Codes, 2019 NFPA 13 & 72 and 2017 ANSI A117.1.
- 10B. Correct to 2021 IBC.

*Sheet 9*

- 10C. Please provide Hydrants on the east side of Harvest Rd within the site at no less than 1000-foot intervals from North of Louisiana Parkway South to Jewell Ave.

*Sheet 10*

- 10D. The Sign Details need to include the minimum mounting height required and the bottom of the lowest sign not being permitted below 84" in height as shown in the detail provided.

*Sheet 13*

- 10E. Sign position needs to show a 30–45-degree angle to oncoming traffic. (TYP).

**11. Aurora Water** (Iman Ghazali / 303-807-8869 / [ighazali@auroragov.org](mailto:ighazali@auroragov.org) / Comments in red)

**Site Plan Comments**

*Sheet 1*

- 11A. The site plan will not be approved by Aurora Water until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.

*Sheet 3*

- 11B. Apologies, upon further internal discussion, the sanitary trunklines in motorcourt shall remain as private service lines. No water and/or sanitary easements are required in motorcourts (TYP).
- 11C. Revise these manholes to cleanouts (TYP).

*Sheet 34*

- 11D. Detention pond side slopes shall be 4:1 and flatter.

**Landscape Plan Comments**

*Sheet 3*

- 11E. Show individual points of connection for all banked meters (TYP).





- 11F. Provide 8 ft of horizontal clearance between water mains and trees.

*Sheet 7*

- 11G. Provide at least 5 ft of horizontal clearance between the tree and meter pit.

*Sheet 18*

- 11H. Plantings shall not obscure meter pits.

**12. PROS** (Michelle Teller; Scott Hammons / 303-739-7437 / [mteller@auroragov.org](mailto:mteller@auroragov.org); [shammons@auroragov.org](mailto:shammons@auroragov.org) / Comments in mauve)

*\*Note that Michelle Teller is no longer with the City of Aurora. Please contact Scott Hammons with questions\**

Site Plan Comments

*Sheet 1*

- 12A. ADVISORY COMMENT - By City Code, Park Development Fees shall be collected by the city to cover the cost of constructing new park facilities to serve the needs of the projected population.

*Sheet 7*

- 12B. Regional trail and greenway corridor shall be subdivided by plat and dedicated to the city at a future date.

*Sheet 11*

- 12C. The trail surface should be Crusher Fines.  
12D. Call out slope on all trails.  
12E. Call out 70ft wide trail corridor.  
12F. Call out 2ft trail shoulder.

*Sheet 13*

- 12G. The trail surface should be Crusher Fines.  
12H. Will there be a street crossing here to connect the trail?  
12I. 12' trail intersection is required.  
12J. Identify a full 70' corridor for the trail. Note that the connector trail will need to be privately owned/maintained.

*Sheet 14*

- 12K. The trail surface should be Crusher Fines.  
12L. Include a note that the regional trail will be dedicated to the City of Aurora at the time of creek improvements.

*Sheet 15*

- 12M. Sidewalks need to be 6ft wide on trail connections.  
12N. Call out park sidewalk width.

*Sheet 34*

- 12O. Before slope, a minimum 2' shoulder at grade needs to be accommodated.  
12P. Label all trail slopes.  
12Q. 2' shoulder at grade is needed, identify on plan.  
12R. All intersections of trails need to be made with a 12' radius for access and turning. Please update and note the maintenance access path and that this is anticipated to be finalized with the crossing for the interceptor project.  
12S. All trails should have a 2' at grade shoulder prior to steep slopes.



Landscape Plan Comments

*Sheet 2*

- 12T. Include a note about the regional trail and 70' corridor to be dedicated to the City of Aurora for ownership and maintenance at the time of the final creek design.

*Sheet 3*

- 12U. Call out the 70ft trail corridor.  
12V. Call out the distance between the private lot line and the edge of trail, maintaining at least 30'.

*Sheet 6*

- 12W. Sidewalks must be 6ft wide.

*Sheet 7*

- 12X. Sidewalks must be 6ft wide.

*Sheet 13*

- 12Y. Call out what grass is being planted here.  
12Z. Include legend.  
12AA. Call out the surfacing.

Subdivision Plat Comments

- 12BB. The regional trail and greenway corridor shall be subdivided by plat and dedicated to the city at a future date, potentially impacting Tracts A and I.

**13. Real Property** (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / [mbrooks@auroragov.org](mailto:mbrooks@auroragov.org) / Comments in magenta)

*Generally*

- 13A. See the Advisory comments on the first page of the plat.  
13B. Check the legal description (and Closure sheet) against the Graphic representation for the boundary of the plat and site plan.  
13C. Fill in any blank lines on both documents.  
13D. The southern portion of the subdivision – revise the name of the Lot and Block as indicated. (Blocks should be separated by a Road (R.O.W. or Tracts).  
13E. Additional R.O.W. should be stated as: (Dedicated to the City of Aurora as Street Right-of-Way \_\_\_\_\_ sq. feet).  
13F. Some of the U.A.E. easement names may need to be changed to a 'Water' type easement name to match the underlying water facility in the easement. (see Legend)  
13G. Check the Fire Lane easement widths – some of the distances are different from the width shown.

**14. Revenue** (Melody Oestmann / 303-739-7395 / [moestman@auroragov.org](mailto:moestman@auroragov.org))

- 14A. Advisory Note from the 1<sup>st</sup> Review: Storm Drain Development Fees due at time of Subdivision Plat recordation: 150.43 acres x \$1,242 = \$186,834.06.



**Right of Way & Permits**

1123 West 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue  
Denver, Colorado 80223  
Telephone: **303.571.3306**  
Facsimile: 303.571.3284  
[donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto:donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

November 2, 2023

City of Aurora Planning and Development Services  
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Aurora, CO 80012

Attn: Dan Osoba

**Re: Parklands Village 1 Subdivision Filing No. 1 - 2nd referral  
Case # DA-2289-03**

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the documentation for **Parklands Village 1 Subdivision F1**. There seems to be a misunderstanding between the "front lot" of a single-family residential lot, and easements for commercial/industrial/retail/apartment-type lots. This may be of some help in deciphering the difference in easement needs:

- **Commercial/School/Apartment Properties**
  - gas main 6'
  - electrical distribution line 10'
  - joint trench 15'
  - transformer 15' x 15'
  - switch cabinet 20' x 20' or 15' x 25' depending on model
  - 10' easement is required along all lot lines abutting any public rights-of-way
- **Residential Property**
  - gas distribution line, front lot 6'
  - electrical distribution line, rear lot 8'
  - joint trench 10'
  - multi-unit developments require a 10' easement along all lot lines abutting any public rights-of-way
  - transformer and switch cabinet remain the same as commercial property
- **Gas Line Clearances – all lots**
  - all gas lines must maintain a minimum 5' of clearance from any structure, therefore, easement must adjust accordingly
- **Gas Lines Not Adjacent to Road Surface – all lots**
  - must be adjacent to drivable pavement/walkway that is a minimum of 8' wide & 6" thick to allow service trucks access and plowing in snowy conditions

Given this, 10' utility easements are not requested on the fronts of single-family-type lots where natural gas distribution facilities are normally located, only 6-feet is needed for these facilities. In situations where both natural gas and electric distribution facilities are located within the same trench, the easement must be 10' wide. Often, multiple higher voltage feeders are located in these areas, typically along public rights-of-way.

Donna George  
Right of Way and Permits  
Public Service Company of Colorado dba Xcel Energy  
Office: 303-571-3306 – Email: [donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto:donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)