

February 23, 2023

City of Aurora
Ms. Debbie Bickmire
15151 E. Alameda Pkwy
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: The Aurora Highlands – Site Plan No.21 and Final Plat | Initial Submittal Review

Dear Ms. Bickmire:

Thank you for taking the time to review the Site Plan and Plat for Filing 21 for The Aurora Highlands. We received comments and valuable feedback on December 14, 2022. Please see the following pages for responses to comments. If you have any questions, please feel free to reach out by phone at 303-892-1166 or by email, spollmiller@norris-design.com.

We look forward to making this project a success with the City of Aurora.

Sincerely,
Norris Design



Samantha Pollmiller
Principal

Initial Submission Review

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. Notification was sent to five (5) adjacent property owners, five (5) outside agencies and five (5) registered community associations. There were no comments received from adjacent property owners or community associations. Comments were received from four outside agencies and are included or attached to this letter.

Response: Noted. Thank you.

2. Zoning and Land Use Comments

2A. Motor courts are a permitted small residential lot; however, the expectation is that all design standards shall be met, regardless of minimum lot size or setbacks. This includes street trees, front yard landscape, and exterior private open space.

Response: Noted. Motor court lot typicals updated to include all landscape design standards.

2B. Each small residential lot shall incorporate a **private, usable outdoor space** or spaces with direct access to the dwelling unit on the lot. A front yard may be counted toward the private usable outdoor space requirement if the front yard meets the minimum dimensions and contains at least 180 square feet of area and have minimum length and width dimensions of 10 feet and the space includes a front porch, deck, or similar space with minimum dimensions of six feet by eight feet.

Response: Private, usable outdoor space is shown on lot typicals. The minimum 180 SF is met and the front yard patios facing the street are 5' x 14' in size (70 sf).

2C. Provide two separate typicals for motor court lots. One for easements and utility services; another for typical setbacks and building separation. Clarify whether an access easement is needed for sidewalks connecting to open spacewalks.

Response: (2) Diagrams for motor court lots have been added as requested. After speaking to Maurice Brooks with Aurora no sidewalk easements will be required.

2D. Show all easements in the lot typicals. The plat shows 5' utility easements in the side yards of motor court lots. Consult Real Property regarding building encroachments into utilities.

Response: All easements are now being shown in the lot typical details. Utility easement has been changed to be a 4' wide so there are no encroachments into the building or building overhangs.

2E. Revise references of duplexes and townhomes and update the Site Data Table to show the total count for single-family detached units.

Response: references updated

2F. Revise the Site Plan Tracking Chart to include the correct names of all Site Plans, add Site Plan/Filing No. 17, and add a column for lots 70' and wider. Add a footnote and differentiate between alley-loaded and motor court lots in the Alternate Load column.

Response: Site plan names added, filing 17 added to charts, a column for lots 70' added, and a footnote for motor court is also included.

2G. Revise the Lot Dimensions Table per the redlines. Additionally, the setbacks in the Lot Area Tables on Sheet 5 duplicate the information, therefore the setbacks can be removed.

Response: lot dimensions updated.

2H. Intervening open space areas should include a sidewalk connection. Please provide a through sidewalk in Tract D or include an explanation for why it cannot be provided.

Response: A sidewalk connection cannot be made through Tract D because the elevation difference is too great to allow for a sidewalk. Also, this space is intended to be a small destination location and not a trail connection.

2I. Why are sidewalk easements proposed rather than including the walks in right-of-way? Please revise the plans or provide justification.

Response: The sidewalk on the knuckle of the cul-de-sac is not included in the ROW to remain consistent with other developments in The Aurora Highlands including Filing 16 & Filing 17.

3. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

Site Plan

3A. An invoice for \$33,807.25 for development application fees was sent on November 18, 2022. Please remit payment prior to the next submittal.

Response: Invoice has been paid.

3B. Add street names, right-of-way width, and street classification for all streets.

Response: Street names, right-of-way width, and street classifications have been added for all streets.

3C. Label all adjacent subdivisions, lots, blocks, and/or tracts. Include reception numbers for recorded subdivisions and case numbers for those in review.

Response: Labeled the surrounding subdivisions, lots, blocks and tracts. Reception numbers will be added when adjacent plats are recorded.

3D. Revise the vicinity map to make line weights consistent, remove drainage information, and add major street labels.

Response: Vicinity map has been revised as requested.

3E. Remove the Recorder's Certificate.

Response: Recorder's Certificate has been removed.

3F. Revise the lot typical diagrams per comments on the redlines.

Response: Lot typical diagrams have been revised as requested.

3G. Revise the lot layout in the Site Plan Lot Tracking Exhibit to match the plat and Site Plan.

Response: Lot layout revised to match plat and site plan.

3H. Distinctly show the right-of-way line for The Aurora Highlands Parkway and add dimensions to the back of the adjacent lots to demonstrate there is a minimum 20' distance between the two.

Response: ROW line for TAH Parkway has been added and a dimension labels from the lots to the ROW have been added.

3I. Show adjacent zone districts.

Response: Adjacent zone districts have been added.

3J. Revise label overwrites and crisscrossing leader lines.

Response: Plans have been revised.

3K. Replace RSN numbers with reception numbers or case numbers. Where applicable for improvements such as detention ponds that were not included in a site plan, please reference the EDN number.

Response: Reception numbers will be added when surrounding plat are recorded.

Letter of Introduction

3L. Revise to replace all FDP references to Master Plan.

Response: All references to Framework Development Plan or FDP have been updated.

3M. Include a brief discussion about front door orientation toward the street for street-fronting motor court homes.

Response: Additional language has been added.

3N. Revise per comments and edits on the redlines.

Response: Noted. All redline comments have been addressed.

4. Landscaping Issues

4A. Calculations for street trees are based on the linear street frontage. The length should not exclude intervening residential driveways. Please recalculate the requirements. Shrubs equivalents can be used to supplement street trees to meet the requirements.

Response: Street tree calculations and quantities updated to included driveways.

4B. Include a note to identify who will be responsible for the motor court shared drives, landscape, and fences.

Response: Landscape and fencing in the Motor courts are under the responsibility of the homeowner. Motor court driveways shall be maintained per a joint maintenance agreement for each motor court.

4C. Show and label mail kiosks and fire hydrants. Darken street light symbols so they are visible.

Response: Labels added. Street light symbols darkened.

4D. Dimension the back of lots to The Aurora Highlands Pkwy. Right-of-way. A minimum 20' separation is required.

Response: Dimensions added.

4E. Many lots exceed 60' frontage. Provide landscape requirements for lots up to the widths included in this site plan. Requirements can be outlined in width increments. Include the maximum turf area.

Response: All large lots are less than 15,000 SF, per the FDP these lots are considered "Large Lots" and the 60' lot typical requirements cover this. Updated the lot typical to be 60'+.

4F. Landscape is required for each motor court lot. Please add an interior landscape. Consider easement locations in tree placement.

Response: Landscape added to all motor court lots. Easements have been added and trees are clear of easement conflict.

4G. Include the setbacks for side yard fences.

Response: Note has been added.

4H. Revise fence symbols so they are more distinctly different.

Response: Fence symbols modified.

4I. Fences along intervening open space tracts should be open-style metal pickets instead of masonry. Please revise.

Response: The masonry walls are located here to fully enclose the rear yards of the lots to mitigate the heavy traffic impacts from The Aurora Highlands Parkway.

4J. Make stop signs more visible or add labels. Street trees should be setback 50' from stop signs.

Response: Stop signs darkened, stop signs are labeled on the civil site plan. Verified trees are setback 50'

4K. Landscape data on Sheet 28 should be consistent with the cover sheet.

Response: The Landscape Area on Sheet 1 is calculated differently than the Shared Landscape Data Table on the landscape sheet, these numbers will not match. The Landscape Area on the cover sheet is calculated off the final plat tract information. The Shared Landscape Data Table on the landscape sheet includes both the Landscape Area and Open Space Areas identified on the cover sheet (from the plat information), as well as any developer sod, shrub beds, crusher fine areas or cobble areas within the internal right of way. A note is included below the Shared Landscape Data Table to clarify how this total landscape area was calculated (note 3).

5. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / pturner@auroragov.org)

5A. Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for addressing and other GIS mapping purposes as soon as possible. Include the parcel, street line, and easement layers at a minimum. Please ensure that the digital file provided in a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. The .dwg file needs to be a 2013 CAD version. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. More information can be found at tinyurl.com/3xe6ds46 or by contacting CADGIS@auroragov.org. You may also contact me if you need additional information about this digital file.

Response: Addressing file has been sent to Phil Turner and has been approved.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

6. Civil Engineering (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / ktanabe@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

Site Plan

6A. The Site Plan will not be approved until the Preliminary Drainage Report is approved.

Response: Acknowledged.

6B. Provide a receiving ramp on the opposite side of T-intersections.

Response: Receiving ramps have been moved to the opposite side of the T-intersections.

6D. Label slopes in alleys (minimum .5%), and tracts (minimum 2% for non-paved areas) on all grading sheets.

Response: Slopes have been labeled.

7. Traffic Engineering (Carl Harline / 303-739-7548 / charline@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

Traffic Impact Study

7A. Revise assumptions for future traffic volumes per comments on Page 6.

Response: All ATD volumes match the FHU Master Plan projections for full buildout of the project. The AM and PM peak hour volumes on the mainline streets were factored to match the intersection volumes in the HR Green Technical Memorandum. The side street in and out volumes were based on the trip generation worksheet for each area served by the side streets. It is important to note that by their own admission the projections in FHU Master Plan are likely overstated as they represent the maximum buildout of each traffic analysis zone. Thus far the

development plans for each TAZ show significantly less development than projected by FHU. However, the location and geometric design of the streets and intersections as recommended by FHU remain intact.

7B. Revise street references as noted.

Response: All street references were updated as of the December 7, 2022 TIS.

7C. Revise to be consistent with the latest review for Filing 9.

Response: The intersection volumes at 32nd Ave. and Highlands Creek match the Filing 9 TIS

7D. Address all comments throughout.

Response:

- 1) Page 2 – The street name box was corrected.
- 2) Page 6 – See response to 7A.
- 3) Page 9 – See response to 7B. Note that they are correct as of December 7, 2022.
- 4) Page 9- A traffic signal at 32nd Ave. and Highlands Creek is warranted and noted in the December 7, 2022 TIS.
- 5) Page 10 – Yes, that is for signalized operation.
- 6) Appendix – The lane geometry was revised in the December 7, 2022, TIS to include a fourth leg at the 32nd/Highlands Creek intersection and match the F9 study. We have no information to add a fourth leg to Street A.

Site Plan

7E. Include sight triangles per TE-13 on both Site Plan sheets and landscaping sheets.

Response: Site triangles have been added per.

7F. The mail kiosk on 34th Ave./Street C is very likely to be in the sight triangle for the Street D approach. Consider relocation per redlines. Is the proposed spot outside of the 34th Place approach?

Response: Mail kiosk relocated.

7G. Add marked crosswalks as noted on the redlines.

Response: Crosswalks have been added where indicated.

7H. Show the opposing accesses on the south side of 32nd Avenue.

Response: Opposing streets on the south side of 32nd Avenue are now being shown.

7I. Set trees back from stop signs so visibility is not obstructed.

Response: Trees moved 50' off signs for visibility.

7J. Add a W11-2 sign (see Sheet 22) for visibility of the pedestrian crossing.

Response: Sign added and trees moved.

8. Fire / Life Safety (Will Polk / 303-739-7371 / wpolk@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Site Plan

8A. Will this site be phased? If so, provide a phasing plan. A phasing plan must be provided with the Planning Department's Site Plan and Public Works Departments' civil plan submittal. The phasing plan must illustrate each phase and provide a narrative that describes how the phasing will implement the required two points of access and a looped water supply at all times during the phased construction. Also, make sure to incorporate COA Water and Public Works phasing requirements into the phasing plan.

Response: This site will not be phased.

8B. Will this site be gated? If this site is gated, then the installation of any gating system will require a City of Aurora licensed contractor to obtain a building permit through the Aurora Building Division prior to the start of any work. This would be considered a structural, life safety, and electrical review within the Building Division that is conducted on behalf of the Fire Chief. If gated, provide sections for the automatic and manual gates.

Response: The site is not gated.

8C. Has USPS been contacted to determine if the proposed mail kiosk locations/delivery methods are acceptable?

Response: USPS has been contacted and locations approved.

8D. Show fire hydrants on the Site Plan sheets.

Response: Hydrants are now being shown on site plan sheets.

8E. Provide a note that identifies the requirement of a separate building permit through the building division prior to any construction for the shade shelter. Please work with the Planning Dept. to identify any addressing needs for this project.

Response: Note has been added to site plan.

9. Aurora Water (Steve Dekoskie / 303-739-7490 / sdekoski@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

Site Plan

9A. Add a note for the motor courts: "Water Services to be sleeved across the garage aprons for all motor court lots."

Response: Note has been added.

9B. Correct the subdivision reference on Sheet 6.

Response: Corrected.

9C. Extension of off-site water mains in E 26th Avenue and The Aurora Highlands Parkway. are required for the second point of connection at E 32nd Avenue for a looped water supply to support this filing.

Response: Extensions of off-site water main in E 26th Avenue and The Aurora Highlands Parkway are now shown.

9D. All water meters require individual tap connections to the main. Two-inch manifold tap connections are not permitted.

Response: Water meters have been revised to have individual tap connections.

9E. Include Case Numbers or EDN numbers for the off-site infrastructure needed to support this filing.

Response: EDN numbers will be added when surrounding developments are approved.

10. PROS (Michelle Teller / 303-739-7437 / mteller@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

Site Plan

10A. General Comment: Per the Aurora Highlands Master Plan, Neighborhood Park 72 is to be completed by 50% CO of lots within this planning area. Your design encompasses more than 50% of the lots in the planning area, therefore design for the neighborhood park should be submitted by the time PROS signs off on the civil plan set.

Response: Noted. The applicant is coordinating with the AACMD to ensure that parks are appropriately provided.

10B. Some areas requested for open space credit do not meet PROS requirements set forth in the [PROS Dedication and Development Criteria Manual](#). Please look at these locations in the site plan and address whether trail corridors can be widened to meet the 30' local trail connection for open space credit.

Response: Open Space dedication has been updated to remove the trail corridor areas in Tracts A, B, and C. Only a portion of these tracts are now dedicated open space.

10C. The numbers within your tracking tables are not consistent. The front table notes a total of 178 units which would equate to 472 people: 1.42 acres of a neighborhood park, 0.52 acres of the community park, and 3.68 acres of open space. Please correct and see redlines.

Response: Numbers updated to be consistent.

10D. Bold this filing in the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Tracking Chart.

Response: Filing 21 has been bolded.

10E. Label tract acreages.

Response: Tracts are labeled with areas.

10F. Tract A is not wide enough to be considered a local trail corridor for credit. Widen to 30' for open space credit. Tract A does not meet the open space criteria set forth in the PROS manual. Remove it from the credit table.

Response: Open Space dedication has been updated to remove the trail corridor areas in Tracts A, B, and C. Only a portion of these tracts are now dedicated open space.

10G. Shift the walk-in Tract B to be central in the corridor. Remove the area noted on the redlines from tract open space credit as it does not meet PROS criteria. If expanded to 30' wide, it will meet local trail criteria and may be credited toward open space.

Response: Open Space dedication has been updated to remove the trail corridor areas in Tracts A, B, and C. Only a portion of these tracts are now dedicated open space.

10H. Widen the sidewalk corridor in Tract C to 30' for open space local trail requirements.

Response: The sidewalk corridor in Tract C will stay same, open space areas have been revised. Open Space dedication has been updated to remove the trail corridor areas in Tracts A, B, and C. Only a portion of these tracts are now dedicated open space.

10I. Provide a crosswalk between Tracts B and C as noted on the redlines.

Response: Crosswalk has been added.

10J. Ensure the playground in Tract B is setback 50' from the right-of-way/curb.

Response: Playground is set back a min. 50' from curb.

10K. If possible, provide connectivity between the trail along 32nd Avenue back into the neighborhood through Tract D, otherwise, it will become a social trail through the tract.

Response: Due to extreme grade within the space and in the trail corridor, and the presents of a concrete drain pan along the back of the lots, a connection is not feasible. Also, this space is intended to be a small destination location and not a trail connection.

10L. Remove the tree lawn turf adjacent to Tract A and note it as a native seed. Keep turf area in the field/shared space only.

Response: The area between Back of Curb and walk is turf throughout The Aurora Highlands, this area is to remain as turf.

10M. Ensure the connection through Tract E is being picked up in the adjacent site plan.

Response: Trail coordinated.

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

Site Plan

11A. The Title Commitment shows ownership as “Century Land Holdings, LLC, A Colorado Limited Liability Company.”

Response: The ownership name on the title commitment and the plat now match.

11B. Revise the Legal Description to match the plat.

Response: Legal description has been revised to match the plat.

11C. Label streets and tracts.

Response: Streets and tracts have been added.

11D. Review and revise duplicate labels and overwrites.

Response: Duplicate labels have been revised as requested.

11E. Label right-of-way width(s) and include reception numbers.

Response: ROW widths have been added. Reception numbers will be added when plat is recorded.

11F. Do sidewalks in motor courts require an access easement?

Response: Since they are not running parallel to the ROW of the street, they are not technically considered sidewalks. Therefore, no easement will be required.

11G. Add labels and edit plans per redline comments.

Response: Understood.

11H. Contact Grace Gray at ggray@auroragov.org to initiate the license agreement process.

Response: Contact will Grace Gray will be made when all the relevant requirements for the license agreement process are gathered from the client following this submittal.

Plat

11I. The vicinity map must show and label all public roads within ½ mile of the site.

Response: Addressed.

11J. Provide a Certificate of Taxes Due.

Response: Certificate of Taxes will be ordered once we get closer to the recording of the Plat.

11K. Include a date in the Surveyor’s Certificate.

Response: We do not set the boundary monuments till we sign the Plat. Per the language in the certificate we will not add the date till we sign the Plat.

11L. Consider grouping the non-plottable easement notes.

Response: Addressed.

11M. Block numbering should be in a logical sequence.

Response: Addressed.

11N. Fill in missing reception numbers.

Response: No recording information available at this time.

11O. Label existing and proposed easements.

Response: Addressed.

11P. Add street names.

Response: Addressed.

11Q. Address all comments, notations, and edits on the redlines.

Response: Addressed.

12. Revenue (Aurora Water/TAPS / Diana Porter/ 303-739-7395 / dsporter@auroragov.org)

12A. Storm Drainage Development fees due: 34.405 acres x \$1,242.0 = \$42,731.01

Commercial users with meters one and one-half inches and smaller with landscaped areas not served by a separate irrigation system shall be charged an outdoor fee based on the total landscaped area.

Response: Noted. Thank you.

13. Aurora Public Schools (Josh Hensley / jd hensley@aurorak12.org)

13A. APS agreed to apply the school land dedication requirement for the purpose of calculating cash-in-lieu of land as site plans are approved for Aurora Highlands. The district will request cash-in-lieu of land when the balance of the obligation from approved site plans exceeds the acreage of school sites to be dedicated. In accordance with Section 4.3.18 of the Unified Development Ordinance, land value for cash-in-lieu will be based on the fair market value of zoned land with infrastructure in place.

Response: Noted. Thank you.

AURORA PUBLIC SCHOOLS - STUDENT YIELD
12/5/2022

Aurora Highlands Site Plan NO 21 (DA-2062-37)

Dwelling Type	Units	Yield Ratio	Student Yield
SFD	82	0.7	57
MF-LOW	96	0.3	29
MF-HIGH		0.145	0
TOTAL	178		86

YIELD	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE SCHOOL		K-8 TOTAL	HIGH SCHOOL		K-12
	RATIO	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	TOTAL
SF	0.34	28	0.16	13	41	0.2	16	57
MF-LOW	0.17	16	0.08	8	24	0.05	5	29
MF-HIGH	0.075	0	0.04	0	0	0.03	0	0
TOTAL		44		21	65		21	86

SCHOOL TYPE	STUDENT YIELD	ACRES PER CHILD	ACRES REQUIRED
ELEMENTARY	44	0.0175	0.7735
MIDDLE	21	0.025	0.5200
HIGH	21	0.032	0.6784
TOTAL	86		1.9719

Aurora Highlands Development Tracking - 12/05/2022

Filing

CSP 1

CSP 2 DA-2062-06

Plat 4 DA-2062-10

Plat 5 DA-2062-11

Plat 8 DA-2062-14

Plat 10 DA-2062-16

Site Plan 14 DA-2062-20

Site Plan 16 DA-2062-23

Plat 6 DA-2062-13

Plat 13 DA-2062-17

Site Plan 15 DA-2062-21

Site Plan 17 DA-2062-26

Aurora Highlands North A DA-2062-31

Aurora Highlands North Area B DA-2062-33

Site Plan 7 DA-2062-36

Site Plan NO 21 DA-2062-37

Total

			Total			Total	Dedication	Status
SFD	MFL	MFH	Units	K-8	HS	Yield	Requirement	
84			84	42	17	59	1.3734	Approved
182	44		226	102	39	141	3.265	Approved
9			9	5	2	7	0.1472	Approved
47			47	24	9	33	0.7685	Approved
174			174	87	35	122	2.8449	Approved
176			176	88	35	123	2.8776	Approved
156	62		218	94	34	128	2.9583	Approved
273			273	137	55	192	4.4636	Approved
26			26	13	5	18	0.4251	Final Mylars
13			13	7	3	10	0.2126	Tech Subm
295	122		417	178	65	243	5.6254	Final Mylars
97			97	49	19	68	1.586	Tech Subm
618	100		718	334	129	463	10.7618	2nd Submittal
585			585	293	117	410	9.5648	1st Submittal
51	38		89	35	12	47	1.0837	2nd Submittal
82	96		178	65	21	86	1.9719	1st Submittal
2,868	462	0	3,330	1,553	597	2,150	49.9298	

AHighlandsNorth_SiteplanNO21_1stSubmittal
12/5/2022

14. Xcel Energy (Donna George / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

14A. Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has **conflicts** with **The Aurora Highlands 21**. PSCo requests 10-foot-wide utility easements around the perimeter of Tract G since there are no "front" or "rear" sides to tracts. These 10-foot easements are used to accommodate both natural gas and electric distribution facilities. Quite honestly, any easements within tracts along roadways should be 10-feet-wide.

The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service 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.

Response: Tract G will eventually be replatted to into lots once the floodplain is revised. At that time, there will be more side yard and rear yard easements, similar to the other single family lots in Filing 21. If a 10' easement was added now around the perimeter, it would just be replatted to the lotting and easements patterns like the other single family lots in Filing 21. To simplify this, we believe the 6'

easement in the front of the lots should stay, because it will not be changing after the floodplain revision.

15. DEN Planning + Design (Lisa Nguyen / lisa.nguyen@flydenver.com)

15A. DEN Planning + Design has no comments at this time. Thank you for the continued opportunity to review and provide comments.

Response: Noted. Thank you.

16. Mile High Flood District (Haley Koesters / submittals@udfcd.org)

16A. We appreciate the opportunity to review this submittal. We are interested in reviewing future drainage plans for this filing for potential maintenance-eligible features. There were no drainage documents submitted for our review at this time. Please reach out to me directly with any questions.

Response: Understood.