

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



May 5, 2023

Tim Sanford
Kings Point Investment, LLLP
2707 Willamette Lane
Greenwood Village, CO 80121

Re: Initial Submission Review – Vistas at Kings Point South – Master Plan
Application Number: **DA-1628-09**
Case Numbers: **2023-7004-00**

Dear Mr. Sanford:

Thank you for your initial submission, which we started to process on April 13, 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 May 25, 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.

Your estimated Administrative Decision date is set for August 9, 2023. Please remember that all abutter notices and the site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the decision date. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause your administrative decision 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.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Erik Gates".

Erik Gates
Planner

cc: Mike Weiher, Terracina Design.
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\1600-1699\1628-09rev1



Initial Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- It appears that the residential density proposed in the future R-2 region exceeds the maximum density of 5 DUs per acre. [Planning]
- Small Lots exceed maximum percentages. Multifamily dwelling units do not increase the number of lots used to determine the percentage of small lots.
- Provide the section for Aurora Parkway and the south half as the obligation of this master plan. [Civil Engineering]
- Verify background traffic volumes with and without the Pine Dr extension. [Traffic Engineering]
- Site traffic assignments are not consistent with site trip generation table and distribution. [Traffic Engineering]
- Two points of access are needed for this site. As Aurora Parkway is currently not complete, provide information showing where these points will be provided. [Fire/Life Safety]
- Extensive coordination is required between this development, the Prusse Development and Kings Point South MUS team to ensure this MUS and others are in conformance with the Kings Point South MUS. [Aurora Water]
- A Tree Protection Plan (TPP) will be required for this site if there are Black Forest trees within its boundaries. [Forestry]
- There are several comments related to park dedication requirements and park elements. [PROS]
- The current (2023) public art fee per residential acre is \$381.13. [Public Art]
- Please see the comment letters from outside agencies, Xcel Energy and MHFD.
- Resubmit the Public Art Plan addressing Comments.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

- 1A. (Thomas Ludlow / 303-552-6620 / thludlow@gmail.com): Our property is immediately south of the project. We are concerned that the development will include substantial grading and earth moving that will result in a significant amount of dirt to be blown onto our property and home. The winds in this location are near constant and can be over 25 mph, and they blow predominately from north to south and we are directly in the path of any dust and dirt created during the development of this project. We are hopeful that substantial measures will be taken to minimize this potential problem.
- 1B. (Patrick Graham / bcocgraham@comcast.net): There is a large herd of approximately 20 antelope which roam this area. Have adequate protections been afforded these animals?
- 1C. (Sierra Vista Douglas Homeowners Association / Thom Russell / thom@sierravistahoa.org):
- Not Extending Pine Drive to Aurora Parkway: Sierra Vista supports the position of not extending Pine Drive to Aurora Parkway for the reasons put forward by the Vistas at Kings Point South development group. Extending Pine Drive is viewed as a detriment to our community.
 - Vistas at Kings Point Planning Area PA-8: This open space buffer needs to be more fully defined regarding berms and landscaping. Sierra Vista's view is that the area should developed as a continuous natural passive buffer rather than an active buffer, with appropriate landscaping and berms. This comment also applies to the adjoining buffer open space associated with Kings Point South.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

[Tab 3 Page 3]

- 2A. This page should be 24"x36".

[Tab 3 Page 4]

- 2B. This page should be 24"x36".

[Tab 6 Page 7]

- 2C. As we move forward, you should be able to clarify your approach to prairie dogs on site, any required surveys related to other species, and your approach to relocation or extermination of prairie dogs.



[Tab 8 Page 3]

2D. There appears to be a numbering typo.

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

[Tab 6 Page 3]

3A. This language and expectation may need to be adjusted. Typically, we will not approve a Master Plan that is not supported by the underlying zoning.

[Tab 8 Page 2]

3B. Since you are proposing small residential lots, the required amount and distribution of single-family housing types is determined by Section 146-4.2.3.A.3. In the R-1 zone district, no more than 25% of the residential lots may be small lots. In the R-2 zone, with fewer than 100 residential lots, no more than 35% of the lots may be small lots. If there are more than 100 lots in the R-2 zone district, 50% of the lots may be small, but they are subject to additional distribution standards described in the referenced code section. While it has been stated that the future proposed R-1 and R-2 zoning boundaries are not known exactly at this time. We will still need this small lot distribution information for each zoning district in order to verify compliance with our small lot standards. In addition, multifamily dwelling units are not part of the “lot” calculation to determine the percentage of “small lots”

3C. Small Lot percentages and related requirements pertaining to product mix, proximity to open space and other requirements will be measured on a per-neighborhood basis, which also coincides with R-1 and R-2 zoning.

3D. Be aware that when proposing to use small lot standards, at least 50% of the standard size lots must use alternate-loaded or recessed garages, while at least 75% of the small lots must use the same.

[Tab 8 Page 3]

3E. These numbers (including the 3 park acres for PA-5) result in an average density for the R-2 region of about 8.8 DUs/acre. The maximum density for the R-2 district is 5 DUs/acre.

[Tab 8 Page 4]

3F. 50% small lots are only allowed in R-2 districts with more than 100 residential lots. 25% small lots is the maximum permitted in the R-1 zone district.

4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues

[Tab 4 Page 5]

4A. The Kings Point North MP does show responsibility for the north half of Aurora Parkway. However, you will need to reach out to Oakwood Homes concerning the relocation of Aurora Parkway in this location. Both master plans should match.

[Tab 6 Page 4]

4B. A separate meeting may be needed to discuss the future of Pine Drive depending on what comments are received on this application from Douglas County or the Town of Parker. A connection to a future Pine Drive may need to be planned for.

5. Parking Issues

5A. There were no parking issues identified in this review.

6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

[Tab 10 Page 6]

6A. Be aware that any front yard fencing, or corner lot side yard fencing less than 4 ft from the back of the sidewalk may only be 42 inches in height. If either of these fencing types is anticipated, a smaller 42-inch fence detail should also be shown here.

[Tab 11 Page 1]

6B. Please include a statement similar to that on the Urban Design Standards: “The design standards listed in this matrix implement the design themes of the MP and are intended to complement and exceed the unified development ordinance (UDO). Unless a waiver has been specifically requested and granted, if a conflict should exist between any specific provisions of this matrix and any other ordinance standards, the higher standards shall govern.”



[Tab 12 Page 8]

6C. These examples do not meet the masonry requirement please replace them.

[Tab 12 Page 10]

6D. Multifamily elevation designs should also be provided with their local site plan review.

[Tab 12 Page 11]

6E. Multifamily elevation designs should also be provided with their local site plan review.

7. Signage Issues

7A. There were no signage issues on this review.

8. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)

[Tab 8 Page 7]

8A. Add a statement to clarify, similar to the Urban Design Tab, that these standards are intended to meet or exceed UDO requirements unless an adjustment has been approved by the planning commission. (See Redlines)

8B. Add "conflict".

8C. Add "the".

[Tab 10 Page 2]

8D. Replace with "more restrictive".

8E. Road missing.

[Tab 11 Page 2]

8F. Please note that crusher fines are not permitted as a mulch treatment.

[Tab 11 Page 4]

8G. Landscape Ordinance? Manual?

[Tab 11 Page 6]

8H. Add a note that sod will not be used. Prohibited by the Non-Functional Turf Ordinance passed in September 2022.

9. Transportation Planning (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7340 / tworker@auroragov.org / Comments in light blue)

9A. There were no transportation planning comments on this review cycle.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

10. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

[Tab 10 Page 7]

10A. Remove this. Streetlights will be COA standard fixtures.

10B. Local streets have a pole height of 20'. Collector streets have a pole height of 30'.

[Tab 10 Page 13]

10C. Where is this street shown?

[PIP Page 5]

10D. Aurora Parkway is an obligation of this property. The PIP should identify the timing of the improvements to Aurora Parkway with regard to permitting.

10E. Add that offsite improvements may be required to meet traffic and life safety needs here and in each planning area.

[PIP Page 6]

10F. Typical planning areas 1-4, include Aurora Parkway as a requirement for each planning area in the narrative and on the exhibits.

[PIP Page 19]

10G. Provide the section for Aurora Parkway and the south half as the obligation of this master plan. Ensure there is no on-street bike lane for the Aurora Parkway section. Please provide a wider sidewalk/bike lane in lieu of the on-street bike lane. Please also ensure this matches all other tabs.



[PIP Page 20]

- 10H. Identify Aurora Parkway as an obligation of this property. Identify the extent required.
- 10I. The Overlook at King's Point is anticipating a second point of access through this property at this location including utility connections. Has this been coordinated with this master plan?
- 10J. Add this note: "The construction of E. Aurora Parkway and required offsite improvements must be completed prior to the issuance of any certification of occupancies for any planning areas."

[PIP Page 21]

- 10K. Typical all exhibits: Identify Aurora Parkway as an obligation of this property. Identify the extents required.

11. Traffic Engineering (Steven Gomez / 303-739-7336 / segomez@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

[Tab 8 Page 5]

- 11A. Label access as full movement, typical.

[Tab 8 Page 7]

- 11B. Should the language reference pro-rated/cost sharing to be provided with Contextual Site Plan.

[Tab 9 Page 6]

- 11C. Label access as full movement, typical.

[TIS Page 1]

- 11D. Buildout year is 2027. Why not 2030, consistent with buildout for Prairie Point (Kings Point North)
- 11E. Verify background traffic volumes with/without Pine Dr extension. Update as necessary.
- 11F. Provide justification for a higher overall % to the north and a lower % to the south without the Pine Drive extension compared to the Pine Drive extension.
- 11G. Site traffic assignments are not consistent with the site trip generation table and distribution.
- 11H. Add Traffic signal warrant evaluation section.
- 11I. See comments throughout the report.

[TIS Page 6]

- 11J. Why not 2030? Consistent with the buildout for Prairie Point (Kings Point North).

[TIS Page 12]

- 11K. Add delay for the signalized results and unsignalized critical movements. overall unsignalized intersection results are not needed typical.
- 11L. By what year 2027, 2040?

[TIS Page 14]

- 11M. Verify, a portion of the WB traffic is destined to/from Parker Road north and wouldn't utilize the Pine Dr extension. In addition, a portion of the EB traffic is destined to/from E-470 north and wouldn't utilize the Pine Dr extension.

[TIS Page 19]

- 11N. This is not consistent with Table 5.
- 11O. Provide a discussion on school trip distribution and assignments.

[TIS Page 20]

- 11P. Provide justification for a higher overall % to the north and lower % to the south without the Pine Drive extension to the south compared to the Pine Drive extension.

[TIS Page 21]

- 11Q. Provide signal warrant and discussion evaluation.

[TIS Page 22]

- 11R. Add signal warrant evaluation and/or discussion for Pine Dr/Inspiration and Pine Dr/Aurora Parkway.

[TIS Page 27]

- 11S. Provide signal warrant evaluation and discussion.

[TIS Page 32]

- 11T. Highlighted is not consistent with Overlook at Kings Point TIS or Kings Point (Prairie Point)MTIS.



[TIS Page 41]

11U. Provide justification for a higher overall % to the north and lower % to the south without the Pine Drive extension to the south compared to the Pine Drive extension.

11V. Provide school trip distribution.

[TIS Page 42]

11W. Provide justification for a higher overall % to the north and lower % to the south without the Pine Drive extension to the south compared to the Pine Drive extension.

11X. Provide school trip distribution.

[TIS Page 43]

11Y. Site traffic assignment is not consistent with the trip generation table and distribution.

[TIS Page 44]

11Z. Site traffic assignment is not consistent with the trip generation table and distribution.

12. Fire / Life Safety (Steve Kirchner / 303-739-7489 / stkirchn@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

[Tab 3 Page 1]

12A. Misspelling here.

[Tab 3 Page 4]

12B. These two locations are critical to providing two points of access to Vistas at Kings Point. Provide information showing these points will be provided.

12C. Question; is the area to the south going to be annexed into the City of Aurora? If so, provide a note indicating future annexation of this area is intended.

[Tab 8 Page 3]

12D. Where is item 1?

12E. Please reflect a 3.5-acre land dedication for a permanent fire station. Any reference to temporary fire stations can be removed from any tab in the master plan submittal.

12F. 2 options for fire station location have been identified on tab 8.3.

12G. Show PA-3 with the fire station land dedication area in this section. See comments on tab 8.3 for further clarification.

[Tab 8 Page 5]

12H. Question; is the area to the south going to be annexed into the City of Aurora? If so, provide a note indicating future annexation of this area is intended.

12I. If providing a 3.5-acre land dedication for a fire station is problematic, could we add the 3.5 acres in the property to the west?

12J. Option #1 for 3.5 acres for a permanent fire station here.

12K. Option #2 for 3.5 acres for a permanent fire station here.

[Tab 8 Page 6]

12L. Replace Fire Marshal with Office of Fire Chief Commander.

[Tab 8 Page 7]

12M. This project is contingent upon a connection of Aurora Parkway across E-470. Currently, Aurora Parkway is a dead-end street and secondary access will be required.

[PIP Page 5]

12N. E Aurora Pkwy needs to cross E-470 and connect to Kings Point North for 2nd access point.

[PIP Page 20]

12O. All drawings need to reflect the 3.5-acre dedication for the fire station.

13. Aurora Water (Nina Khanzadeh / 720-859-4365 / rkhanzad@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

[MUR Page 1]

13A. Extensive coordination is required between this development, the Prusse Development and KP South MUS team to ensure this MUS and others are in conformance with the KP South MUS.

[MUR Page 4]

13B. Show and label limits of Antelope Creek, Prairie Point, King's Point South, and the Overlook at King's Point South.



[MUR Page 5]

13C. A looped water line is required at all times during development.

13D. Only 292 units were accounted for in KP South MUS.

13E. Add: "South".

[MUR Page 8]

13F. Need coordination so that the Lift Station and Forcemains are sized accordingly in regards to this development and the offsite Overlook development. Coordinate with HR Green.

[MUR Page 9]

13G. Spelling error.

13H. Include offsite basins.

13I. Need extensive coordination with KP South and Overlook at KP South to ensure all documents are in conformance with approved KPN and KPS MUS.

[MUR Page 10]

13J. Refer to the amendment approved in January 2023.

13K. Final version was approved in December 2022.

[MUR Page 12]

13L. Show the relationship and property boundaries between this development and Prairie Point, King's Point South, and others.

[MUR Page 14]

13M. Prusse MUS shows a sanitary main going to the eastern border- Clarify and adjust with them.

13N. Show connection points and the design points to existing sanitary infrastructure.

13O. Only 292 units accounted for in Kings Point South MUS- There are over 300 here. Need to have discussions with KP South to account for additional development- Please coordinate if needed.

13P. Need to account for offsite basins.

[MUR Page 15]

13Q. The Overlook at KP South shows that your development will have the water main going south to connect- Please coordinate with them.

13R. Need to account for offsite basins.

[MUR Page 17]

13S. Send live calcs to me via email.

[MUR Page 18]

13T. Ensure all offsite basins are accounted for coordinate with Prusse development to ensure all stubs and connections are provided.

[MUR Page 26]

13U. Send live calcs to me via email.

[MUR Page 27]

13V. Identify design point.

[MUR Page 28]

13W. Identify design point.

[MUR Page 30]

13X. Utilize the most recent version of the approved MUS for King's Point south.

[MUR Page 35]

13Y. Show offsite Prusse property.

14. Forestry (Rebecca Lamphear / 303-739-7177 / rlamphea@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

[Tab 8 Page 1]

14A. This site is subject to the Black Forest Ordinance. A Tree Protection Plan (TPP) will be required for this site if there are Black Forest trees within its boundaries.

The TPP is required to be the first document that is approved, and the approval of the site plan and civil plan will follow. All documents must line up with the TPP.

**15. PROS** (Curtis Bish / 303-739-7131 / cbish@auroragov.org / Comments in mauve)

[Tab 8 Page 3]

- 15A. Need clarification of the type of planned residential - multi-family versus SFA. If SFA, such as townhomes, still is considered a Single Family unit for purposes of projecting population impact. Please specify as the answer has implications on PROS land dedication requirements.
- 15B. 2.5 persons per unit is a valid multiplier only if the residential intended for PA-1 is multi-family. If single-family attached is being planned instead, the multiplier should be 2.65 persons per unit. Update population calculations if applicable.

[Tab 8 Page 4]

- 15C. PROS calculates land dedication requirements to the 100th rather than the 10th of an acre. Please update. Also, update accordingly if the numbers in Lines 11 and 12 fail to accurately represent the type of proposed residential units for PA-1.

[Tab 8 Page 8]

- 15D. Numbers 13 and 14 are out of date and need not be included if no major arterial streets pass through or abut the development.

[Tab 9 Page 2]

- 15E. May or "will?" Proposed open space must provide recreational, conservation, and/or educational value and benefit. The provision of trails and trailside activity nodes with site furnishings are typically provided to satisfy land dedication criteria.
- 15F. Include linework on the Open Space Plan map.
- 15G. Sidewalks are not trails, generally speaking. Distinguishing between the two would be preferred in the narrative and mapping.

[Tab 9 Page 3]

- 15H. As noted in the Tab 8 redlines, PROS calculates land dedication requirements to the 100th rather than the 10th of an acre. Please update.
- 15I. Change this to 146-4.3.18.B.

[Tab 9 Page 4]

- 15J. Applicable neighborhood park programmatic elements will be governed by the design criteria in effect at the time of Site Plan submittal. Language limiting that nothing more or different will be provided cannot be included in this Master Plan.
- 15K. This could happen, but only with approval from PROS as well.
- 15L. Playgrounds must comply with the requirements of the PROS Dedication & Development Criteria Manual. Expand the narrative accordingly, such as describing the provision of inclusive play features, etc.
- 15M. Only upon approval from PROS and if there is agreement from the school district for shared public use.

[Tab 9 Page 5]

- 15N. This trigger

[Tab 9 Page 6]

- 15O. What is the 1/2 mile service radius for the park? Please show.
- 15P. A trail through this open space. Include symbology for trails in the legend.
- 15Q. How will PA-8 provide open space value and benefit? Show on the map if it is to be interconnected to other spaces for pedestrian and bicycle mobility.
- 15R. Has thought been given to the possibility of an open space corridor and trail being provided in conjunction with a maintenance path for what appears may become a drainage way leading to the detention pond?

16. Real Property (Roger Nelson / 720-587-2657 / ronelson@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

- 16A. There were no Real Property comments on this review.

**17. Public Art** (Roberta Bloom / 303-739-6747 / rbloom@auroragov.org)

17A. The current (2023) fee per residential acre is \$381.13 (not \$282.57). Please use that number to calculate the total public art requirement. Then use that new total to recalculate the line items in the public art budget and resubmit. The current Public Art Guidelines for Metro Districts are attached to this letter.

[Tab 7 Page 2]

17B. With the current budget, staff recommends one public art location.

17C. Update this cost.

18. Xcel Energy (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

18A. To ensure that adequate utility easements are available within this development, PSCo requests that the following language or plat note be placed on the preliminary and final plats for the subdivision:
“Six-foot (6’) wide utility easements are hereby dedicated on private property adjacent to the front lot lines and eight-foot (8’) on the rear lot lines of each lot in the subdivision or platted area identified as single-family lots. Ten-foot (10’) wide utility easements are hereby dedicated on private property adjacent to all public streets, and around the perimeter of each multi-family lot in the subdivision or platted area including tracts, parcels and/or open space areas. These easements are dedicated to the City of Aurora for the benefit of the applicable utility providers for the installation, maintenance, and replacement of electric, gas, television, cable, and telecommunications facilities. Utility easements shall also be granted within any access easements and private streets in the subdivision. Permanent structures, improvements, objects, buildings, wells, water meters and other objects that may interfere with the utility facilities or use thereof (Interfering Objects) shall not be permitted within said utility easements and the utility providers, as grantees, may remove any Interfering Objects at no cost to such grantees, including, without limitation, vegetation. Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCo) and its successors reserve the right to require additional easements and to require the property owner to grant PSCo an easement on its standard form.”

18B. PSCo also requests that all utility easements be depicted graphically on the preliminary and final plats. While these easements should accommodate the majority of utilities to be installed in the subdivision, some additional easements may be required as planning and building progresses.

18C. In addition, 31-23-214 (3), C.R.S., requires the subdivider, at the time of subdivision platting, to provide for major utility facilities such as electric substation sites, gas or electric transmission line easements and gas regulator/meter station sites as deemed necessary by PSCo. While this provision will not be required on every plat, when necessary, PSCo will work with the subdivider to identify appropriate locations. This statute also requires the subdivider to submit a letter of agreement to the municipal/county commission that adequate provision of electrical and/or gas service has been provided to the subdivisions.

18D. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas via xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. For additional easements that may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities, the Designer must contact a Right-of-Way and Permits Agent

19. Mile High Flood District (Laura Hinds / 303-455-6277 / submittals@mhfd.org)

19A. As noted in the drainage report, discharged flows from design point OS 5 will be conveyed through the site via an open channel. However, that area has a proposed residential land use and it appears flows are routed south along the parcel boundary. Please help us to understand the intended plan and if the existing tributary will remain open channel, in which case a tract will need to be dedicated.

20. E-470 Public Highway Authority (Brandi Kemper / 303-537-3727 / bkemper@e-470.com)

20A. Outside the E-470 corridor, no comments.