

March 04, 2020

City of Aurora  
Brandon Cammarata  
15151 E. Alameda Pkwy, Suite 2300  
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: **Second Submission Review** – Sterling Hills AMH – Site Plan and Plat  
Application Number: **DA-1052-24**  
Case Number: **2019-4014-00; 2019-3044-00**

Dear Mr. Cammarata

Thank you for taking the time to provide comments from the Second Submission for the Site Plan and Plat of Sterling Hills AMH. Our staff has received, and reviewed comments received on January 9, 2020. We have made the following changes. Please reach out with any questions a [scrowder@norris-design.com](mailto:scrowder@norris-design.com) or 303-892-1166

Sincerely,  
Norris Design



Samantha Crowder  
Senior Associate

## Second Submission Review

### SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- ✓ The front lot lines need be at back of sidewalk and front setbacks are measured from back of sidewalk. The building envelopes along Water Drive do not meet front setbacks and the front lot lines should be at back of sidewalk.

**Response: Comment noted. The lot lines have been adjusted to reflect this change.**

- ✓ Building elevations do not appear to be meeting the 15% masonry requirement and the calculations are not done correctly.

**Response: Masonry has been increased to meet the 15% minimum requirement and calculations have been updated.**

- ✓ Please add banding or similar architectural features as part of the lot size mitigation approach.

**Response: Banding has been added.**

### 1. Community Questions Comments and Concerns

1A. No neighbor comments received.

**Response: Comment noted, thank you.**

### 2. Zoning, Design Standards and Clarity of the Application

#### Lots Facing Water Drive

2A. Front lot lines need to be located at back of the proposed detached sidewalks. Currently they appear to be near back of curb.

**Response: Lot lines have been adjusted to back of walk as requested.**

2B. All building envelopes need to meet proposed setbacks with setback along streets measured from the back of sidewalk. The front setbacks along Water Drive do not meet this requirement. All proposed setbacks should not be less than Subarea C allowances described in Table 4.2-6. These setbacks do require an adjustment request for this project in Subarea B.

**Response: Lots have been adjusted to meet the minimum setbacks indicated with the requested adjustment. Two lots along Waters Drive, which did not meet these requirements, have been removed as well.**

#### Street Trees Along Water Drive

2C. All street trees along Water Drive need to be large canopy varieties of trees. Revise adjustment request as needed while making every effort to minimize the adjustment resulting from the utility in the tree lawn near Dunkirk. Building Elevations

**Response: Large canopy trees have been provided in place of columnar species. A landscape tract has been added adjacently, northeast of the sidewalk, to incorporate three canopy trees behind the sidewalk where the existing storm utility conflict exists.**

2D. As currently presented the materials quantities represented appear to be below required percentages. Prior to Planning Commission please update your elevations so basic materials requirements are met per below:

- The 15% masonry calculation is 15% of all sides of the building (not just the front). You may exclude windows and doors to identify to total façade area. You also must include the gable sides.

**Response: Percentage of masonry has been updated.**

- The square footage of masonry identified appears to be overstated as a quantity and a percentage.

**Response: Percentage of masonry has been updated.**

2E. Recommend a physical materials board for the Planning and Zoning Commission Hearing.

**Response: Noted. A physical material board will be provided with hearings.**

2F. Recommend a color elevations perspective or illustrative to exhibit for Planning and Zoning Commission Hearing.

**Response: Noted. Colored elevations will be provided with hearings.**

2G. Please include banding, materials, color or texture changes at the “ceiling” level between first and second floor and at the bottom of the gable on the sides of the alley loaded products as a component of mitigation for the lot size adjustment to enhance the limited usable space along the sides of the homes.

**Response: Comment noted. Banding has been added.**

#### Cover Sheet

2H. Adjust data block per redlines which includes adjusting the parking requirement to reflect code requirements.

**Response: The parking requirement has been adjusted to reflect the current lot count.**

2I. Make clerical adjustment identified in the redlines.

**Response: The remaining comments on the sheets have been addressed.**

#### Lot Size Adjustment

2J. With the reduced lot size outdoor space is less for each lot. A part of the mitigation for smaller lot should be to maximize the functionality and usability of the remaining outdoor space. With the alley loaded product the side yard should be consciously designed to be accessible and usable. Please describe how the design of these side areas will be usable with how the areas is accessed from the front door of the home, landscape/hardscape design and enhance building architecture such as banding and wainscot adjacent to usable areas.

**Response: The request for smaller lots is mitigated through the introduction of additional commons space provided along Waters Drive. In addition, many of the homes provide additional urban design elements such as first and second floor porches and low walls within front yards.**

#### Plat

2J. Please eliminate many of the unbuildable tracts and incorporate the tracts as part of the adjacent buildable lots. See redlines.

**Response: Tracts have been removed and incorporated into lots in several areas around the Site. The Tract at the southeast corner of Drive A and Villanova remained for drainage purposes. An additional Tract, Tract J, was added along E. Water Drive to provide additional tree planting areas that are not encumbered with an easement.**

2K. The front lot lines along Water Drive need to be moved to the north and west so the lot lines along the street will be along the back of the proposed detached sidewalk.

***Response: The tract line that defines Lots 1-9 in Block 1 have been shifted to be behind the detached walk in order to comply with the typical local type I road section. The lot setbacks are now determined from this new alignment***

### **3. Landscape Design Issues**

Kelly K. Bish, PLA, LEED AP/ Kbish@auroragov.org/ (303) 739-7189/ PDF comments in teal.

Sheet 1 Cover Sheet

3A. Change waivers to adjustments.

***Response: This has been corrected.***

Sheet 5 Landscape Notes, Tables, and Plant List

3B. Two Tract C's need to be separated out into their own tracts.

***Response: Tracts have been revised and renamed.***

3C. See comment on landscape plan regarding the B tracts. These tracts appear to be paved alley.

***Response: Tracts have been revised and renamed***

Sheet 6 Landscape Plan

3D. Has the city permitted the extension of the actual lot to include the sidewalk as well as more than half the curbside landscape area?

***Response: This area has been revised to allow for a 9' curbside landscape area. The sidewalk is no longer located on lots as a part of an easement.***

3E. The trees along E. Water Drive should be more of a canopy tree and not a columnar tree to match the trees along the west side of the street.

***Response: Large canopy trees have been provided in place of columnar species.***

3F. Provide a table that demonstrates compliance with the curbside landscape requirements of 0.025 shrubs per square footage of curbside landscaping.

***Response: A table identified as, Curbside Landscape Table, has been added to sheet 7 which demonstrates the shrub equivalents of 1 shrub per 40 square feet (.025 shrubs per square foot) have been accounted for, for each street.***

3G. Because this is being reviewed under the new UDO, the curbside landscape areas as indicated should be landscaped with shrubs/ornamental grasses/native seed etc. Anything less than 10' is not permitted as sod.

***Response: Curbside landscape has been revised per the code requirements of the new UDO.***

3H. The response letter for the previous set of review comments indicates that the trees species along E. Villanova Place was narrowed from 6 species to 3, but there are still four species specified.

***Response: Revised to 3 species.***

3I. The walls proposed along the Private Drive B appear to be going through the proposed alley.

***Response: The walls are located at the end of the alley. There is no direct connection intended from Primary Drive B to Alley D. Alley D may be accessed from E Water Drive and Alley E.***

3J. Shouldn't the areas indicated in yellow be separate tracts?

***Response: Tracts have been revised.***

3K. The 5 DRS could possibly get between 2'-3' tall outside the permitted 26" as measured from the roadway surface.

***Response: Plant material within sight distance triangle has been revised to lower growing species. In this particular instance, Dwarf Russian Sage has been replaced with Gro Low Sumac.***

Sheet 8 On-Lot Typical Landscape Plans.

3L. Provide an overall site plan/key map that identifies the landscape lot types being proposed here: Lot Type B (Alley Lot) Lot Type A (Non-Alley Lot), Lot Type B (E. Water Drive Condition) and Lot Type B (E. Villanova Place Condition).

***Response: On-Lot Typical Plans have been renamed to correspond to the specific lot type nomenclature consistent with the site plan. For additional reference, annotation has been added to the landscape plan to identify a typical lot condition where it exists in plan.***

3M. For those lots that do not have a feature such as the following, these requirements should be updated to include one: a low wall, earth berm or natural boulder both in the written requirements and indicated in the lot typicals as well.

***Response: These are not requirements of GDP and will not be included.***

3N. The E. Water Drive lot typical should be updated to remove the retaining wall since it is no longer being provided.

**Response: This condition no longer exists, and the lot typical has been removed.**

3O. The curbside landscape area for E. Water Street needs to be treated like the other streets A & B within the development. Shrubs shall be provided at a ratio of 0.025 shrubs per sf of curbside landscape

**Response: Noted. This condition no longer exists, and the curbside landscape has been redesigned per the new UDO code.**

#### **4. Addressing**

Phil Turner / 303-739-7271 / pturner@auroragov.org

4A. Please submit a preliminary digital addressing .SHP or a .DWG file as soon is possible. This digital file is used for street naming, addressing and preliminary GIS analysis. Include the following layers as a minimum: (1) Parcels; (2) Street lines; and (3) Building footprints (If available).

**Response: The applicant will coordinate the site plan with addressing after we receive comments back on the revised layout presented with this submittal.**

4B. Please ensure that the digital file is provided in a NAD 83 feet, State plane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please provide a CAD .dwg file that is a 2013 CAD version. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Please e-mail these files to me.

**Response: Comment noted. Thank you.**

4C. Here is additional information regarding the City of Aurora's CAD submission requirements:

The city has developed CAD Data Submittal Standards for internal and external use to streamline the process of importing AutoCAD information into the city's Enterprise GIS. Please note that a digital submission meeting the CAD Data Submittal Standards is required before your final site plan mylars can be routed for signatures or recorded. Please review the CAD Data Submittal Standards and email your Case Manager the .DWG file before submitting your final site plan mylars. Once received, the city's AutoCAD Operator will run an audit report and your Case Manager will let you know within 2-3 days whether the .DWG file meets or does not meet the city's CAD Data Submittal Standards.

**Response: The CAD digital submittal will be coordinated with the City prior to final recording.**

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

#### **5. Civil Engineering**

Kristin Tanabe / (303) 739-7306 / ktanabe@auroragov.org

Site Plan (Preliminary Plat)

5A. Sidewalk easement not required since this is a private street. A private easement would be dedicated by separate document if needed, page 2.

**Response: The lot line along E. Water Drive was adjusted in order to place the sidewalk within the private roadway tract, therefore the sidewalk easement was removed.**

5B. Add the following note: In locations where utility easements overlap drainage easements, only subsurface utilities shall be permitted within the portion of the utility easement that overlaps the drainage easement. Installation of above ground utilities within a drainage easement requires prior written approval by City Engineer, page 2.

**Response: The note has been added on page 2 as note number 17.**

5C. The streetlight or pedestrian light installation within the public right-of-way shall be designed, funded, and constructed by the developer/owner. Ownership and maintenance of the street/pedestrian lights shall be the responsibility of the City of Aurora once they have been accepted. Street light and/or pedestrian photometrics plans shall be prepared and submitted to the City for review and approval and shall become a part of the approved civil construction plans for the project. An electrical plan showing site location of lights, electrical one line and grounding details shall be submitting to the Permit Center for review by the Building Department. The owner is responsible for obtaining an address for the meter(s) from the Planning Department. A Building Permit for the meter and a Public Inspections Permit for the street lights are required. Certificate of occupancies will not be issued until the street and/or pedestrian lighting plans are approved, constructed, and initially accepted. Page 2

**Response: Noted.**

5D. Curb ramp required at community mailbox, typical, page 3

**Response: The community mailbox locations have been consolidated on E. Water Drive and have a curb ramp for access.**

5E. 3:1 max slope on site, page 4.

**Response: Additional slope tags have been added to the plans and a retaining wall has been added at the end of Alley C.**

5F. Label slope of street, page 4

**Response: Additional slope labels have been added to the on-site and surrounding streets.**

5G. Villanova and Sterling Hills Parkway are collector streets. Please use the SL-3 designation and requirements for both streets, page 9.

**Response: Street lighting at Sterling Hills Pkwy revised to SL-3.**

5H. Label street names, page 9.

**Response: Labels have been added.**

5I. Both streets are collectors. Please use SL-3 for both, page 9.

**Response: Street lighting at Sterling Hills Pkwy revised to SL-3.**

## **6. Real Property**

Darren Akrie / (303) 739-7331 / dakrie@auroragov.org

7A. See the red line comments on the plat and site plan.

**Response: The red line comments on the plat and site plan have been seen and addressed. Individual comment responses to the comments on these plan sets have been added to the pdf document**

7B. Make sure the plat easements match the site plan easement exactly and all the boundary info is the same.

**Response: Easements have been coordinated to have the same callouts between the Plat and Site Plan.**

7C. Continue working with Andy Niquette on the easement releases.

**Response: We will continue to work with Andy Niquette on any easements that are being relinquished.**

7D. Contact Grace Gray to start the procedures for the License Agreement encroachments and the potential revocable License for the items noticed in the details for the lot frontages.

**Response: The team will reach out to Grace Gray and work with her to obtain the necessary license agreements associated with the site.**

**7. Traffic Engineering**

Brianna Medema / (303) 739-7336 / bmedema@auroragov.org

8A. No Comments

**Response: Noted.**

**8. Parks Department**

Chris Ricciardiello, 303-739-7154, cricciar@auroragov.org

9A. No additional Comments.

**Response: Comment noted, thank you.**

**9. Aurora Water**

Steven Dekoskie / 303-739-7490 / sdekoski@auroragov.org

10A. Lot drainage cannot be directed over water meter pits in the alley. 2.5' clearance between meter pits is required (please dimension all setbacks). Include cross section of proposed meters on property line and drainage swales. Roof drains must be directed away from meter pits. Min setback off of lot lines is 1.5' to edge of meter pit. No fencing is permitted on the pocket easement for the water meters. Top of meter pits should be level with finished grade. No dry utilities are permitted to cross the pocket easement for the water meters. (page 2)

**Response: Notes have been added to the standard alley loaded lot detail on page 2. These notes address lot drainage, meter pit separation, minimum lot setback, fencing exclusions, meter pits being level with finished grade, utility exclusions from the pocket easements and some additional dimensioning on the detail. These notes and dimensioning should meet the requirements above in order to install the meter pits for these lots correctly. The water meters have also been added to the alley loaded lot typical section.**

**10. Xcel Energy Donna George / donna.george@xcelenergy.com / 303-571-7586**

See letter date January 2, 2020 relating to clarifications.

**Response: We are continuing our conversations with Xcel energy and are working closely with them to accommodate the on-site dry utility needs.**

**11. Aurora Public Schools**

Josh Hensley / / (303) 365-7812

12A. The school land dedication obligation for this portion of Sterling Hills is fulfilled. There is not additional school land requirement for this proposal.

**Response: Comment noted, thank you.**

**12. Arapahoe County**

Terri Maulik / 720-874-6650

13A. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this project. The Arapahoe County Planning Division has no comments; however, other Divisions and/or Departments in Arapahoe County may submit comments.

**Response: Comment noted, thank you.**