



July 21st, 2023

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

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

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

KA#: 222010

To Dan Osoba:

We received the Development Review staff comments dated April 20th, 2023. Please see our responses below:

Summary of Key Comments from all Departments:

- How are these green court areas "usable" if they are encumbered by a drainage easement and the associated drainage infrastructure? Staff has concerns about the usability of the common green space (50% minimum). for all green courts given the grade shown and potential infrastructure that could preclude usability.

Response: All green courts are now showing a variety of passive and active recreation spaces. The grade change within each green court is now minimal and has been revised since the last submittal.

- Dimensional standards for townhomes are not being met and adjustments are not included in the letter of introduction: front and side setbacks, and rear setback maximum for alley-loaded product.

Response: Adjustments have now been included in the SDP set and the letter of introduction.

- The eastern units facing east are "half" of a green court. Staff is concerned that there is not enough space to accommodate the open space, plant material, sidewalk, and required 17' green court.

Response: The eastern most facing green court has now been programmed to provide residents with a community gathering and seating space. The green court has also been widened to 17' in width to meet the required dimension.

- Guest parking is only required for green court configurations that preclude street connectivity on both ends of the green court. This lot configuration does have street connectivity on the ends of all green courts; guest parking is not required. Please revise the parking space requirement to 140.

Response: Acknowledged, the parking count has been revised.

- EIFS is not a permitted building material. It shall be 3-coat stucco, typical for all elevations.



Response: EIFS note has been removed and changed to a 3-coat stucco system.

- Internal pedestrian paths and bicycle paths shall be lit and provide consistent illumination of at least one foot candle on the walking surface. Additional SB fixtures should be utilized along pedestrian paths and adjacent to bicycle racks.

Response: Acknowledged. The Photometrics Plan is being coordinated with the Architectural Elevations so that the planned building lights at the front doors are included in the analysis to ensure 1fc minimum is provided on walking surfaces.

- Per section 4.02.7.05.7 of the Roadway Manual, if the horizontal distance between terraced walls is less than twice the height of the lower wall, then the entire wall shall be considered to act as one wall. The max height of any wall in a residential area is 4'. Minimum 8' between terraced walls in order for the walls to be considered separate.

Response: Acknowledged. A Variance Request to allow wall heights greater than the maximum allowed within residential areas and for a reduction in the horizontal distance between terraced walls was submitted to and is under review by the City Engineer.

Planning Department Comments:

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

Response: Acknowledged.

1b. Comments were received from Xcel Energy and Aurora Public Schools. Please see the comments attached to this letter. Provide a response as necessary in a response to comments letter.

Response: Acknowledged.

2a. Development Review fees are due prior to the second submission in the amount of \$32,803.00. Please refer to the invoice sent when the application was accepted.

Response: Acknowledged.

2b. Change variance to adjustment.

Response: Acknowledged.

2c. For the zoning map amendment, please provide a metes and bounds legal description and exhibit to be used with the ordinance when the application goes to council. This description should include the area to be rezoned, which is the property and half of the adjacent rights-of-way.

Response: A rezone package providing the metes and bounds legal description and a proposed zoning exhibit has been included with this submittal.

2d. In addition to the Zoning Map Amendment criteria, please respond to the Site Plan criteria for approval found in Section 146-5.4.3.B.2.c.i.





Response: Acknowledged. A response to the site plan approval criteria has been included in the letter of introduction.

Site Plan Comments:

2e. Property area must match the plat legal dription.

Response: The property area shown on the Site Plan is post R.O.W. dedications that are being done on the plat. I have additional language for clarity.

2f. Change from new to proposed.

Response: Acknowledged. Change has been made.

2g. Add (Typical for all dwelling units).

Response: Acknowledged. Additional language has been added.

2h. Ensure these area percentages adds up to 100%.

Response: Acknowledged. The numbers haven been updated.

2i. Adjustment requests along with all justification and mitigation measures must be included on the cover sheet of this site plan. Include code sections for the adjustment along with the percentage of the adjustment request (if applicable).

Response: Acknowledged. A new sheet has been added to reflect the adjustments

2j. Remove sheet 18 as the elevation is not applicable.

Response: Sheet has been removed from drawing set.

2k. Typical for linework on all sheets. Clearly identify the property line on all lots using a bold line (different than development boundary). It is difficult to discern the building, easement, and property boundaries on the lots shown.

Response: Acknowledged. Linetypes have been added to the legend for clarity.

2l. Please make the proposed boundary more bold for clarity.

Response: Acknowledged. The lineweight has been adjusted as requested.

2m. These setback lines are shown outside of the individual properties of the townhomes. It is unclear what the setback line is intended to illustrate. Please relocate all setback lines interior to the properties or just show the setbacks on a lot typical.

Response: The setback lines have been removed as the intial submittal referenced an incorrect code section.

2n. Add a height to the pedestrian railing item in the legend.



Response: Acknowledged. Height information has been added.

2o. Add a note to indicate that the lot typicals are located on the site details sheet.

Response: Acknowledged. A note has been added.

2p. Enlarge these typicals as much as possible to ensure printing on mylars is legible.

Response: Acknowledged. The detail scale has been adjusted.

3a. (LOI) Generally, additional information and justification should be provided for all adjustment requests including additional requests needed for setbacks. Make sure to include how the request is compliant with the criteria for approval found in Section 146-5.4.4.D.3.

Response: A complete summary of all adjustment requests have been include in the SDP and within the LOI. An explanation justifying the request has also been included.

3b. (LOI) Include additional adjustment requests as necessary (see cover sheet redlines for details). Please coordinate with staff ahead of your second submittal to discuss the requests and associated mitigation/justification.

Response: A complete summary of all adjustment requests have been include in the SDP and within the LOI. The applicant has discussed the requested adjustments wth planning staff and associated departments.

3c. (LOI) What is the requested adjustment area and to which units does the adjustment apply? The minimum per UDO is 1,600 s.f.; "The applicant is proposing a reduction to ____ s.f. (___%)."

Response: An adjustment is being requested to reduce the minimum lot area of a single-family attached lot fronting a public street from 1,600 SF to 1,000 SF on the 9 lots fronting Sable Blvd.

3d. (LOI) For all adjustment requests, separate and add more details on mitigation measures included for the requests. For example: bicycle parking is provided when none provided to increase multi-modal connectivity.

Response: Additional mitigation measures have been included to the letter of Introduction for all adjustment requests.

3e. (LOI) Consider adding additional discussion on the Aurora Places Plan "Housing for All" goal. You may also consider reviewing the Aurora Housing Study (adopted December 2020).

Response: Additional discussion has been added to the Letter of Introudction and references the "Housing for All" goal and the Aurora Housing Study.

3f. (LOI) Include additional discussion on the compatibility of the proposed size, scale, height, and density here. Any efforts to further make the project compatible should also be discussed.





Kephart Response: Additional discussion has been included within the LOI discussing the proposed size, scale, height, and density of the project and how it fits within the adjacent context.

3g. (Subdivision Plat) If lot lines are extended to reduce/remove the adjustment requests (see comments on the cover sheet of the site plan), modify lot lines, dimensions, and square footage as necessary, typical.

Response: Lot lines have remained the same and a request for adjustments still pertains.

3h. (Site Plan Sheet 2) The following standards apply to all SFA townhome units:

- Lot Size: 1380 s.f. for end units; 1250 s.f. for interior units (adjustment requested)
- Front setback: 10' (adjustment needed**)
- Side abutting Montview or 21st Ave: 10' (adjustment needed**)
- Interior side: 5' (adjustment needed**)
- Rear: 3' max OR 20' min (appears to be in compliance).

It is suggested to increase the lot size and accommodate the front yard setback requirement by extending the front property line to the ROW and the exterior side yard setback to Montview and 21st. Non-street-facing interior setbacks should be extended to accommodate the setback requirement.

Response: Incorporating the front yard setback on all Townhome units would result in a significant density loss and decreased dedicated green court space. As mitigation, all green courts have been programed with highly desired amenities

3i. (Site Plan Sheet 2) How are these green court areas "usable" if they are encumbered by a drainage easement and the associated drainage infrastructure, (typical for all green court areas)? Staff has concerns about the usability of the common green space (50% minimum) for all green courts given the grade shown and potential infrastructure that could preclude usability.

Response: All green courts are now programmed with a variety of passive and active recreation spaces. The grade change within each green court is now minimal and has been revised since the last submittal. The applicant has spoken to planning staff about the proposed green court programming and believe the direction is beneficial for the project.

3j. (Site Plan Sheet 2) In general, staff supports a variety of approaches to provide usable spaces. Typical approaches include usable turf areas or commons patio spaces with amenities. In some cases, active spaces have also been proposed, such as horseshoe pits or similar. Generally, turf areas should have a minimum dimension of 18 feet with trees placed along the outside to preserve usable spaces. Hardscape common gathering spaces are also an option with site furniture and amenities. With numerous green courts, a mix of these approaches is supported. These green courts need to provide more flat spaces to accommodate the previously mentioned approaches.

Response: All green courts are now programmed with a variety of passive and active recreation spaces. The grade change within each green court is now minimal and has been revised since the last





submittal. The applicant has spoken to planning staff about the proposed green court programming and believe the direction is beneficial for the project.

3k. (Site Plan Sheet 2) In order to comply with Section 146-4.2.3.C.1.b.viii regarding green court standards, there shall not be intervening common open space between the end unit and the ROW, typical for all units shown.

Kephart Response: The applicant is seeking an adjustment to this requirement due to the grade change found on site and the need for retaining walls. we have strategically placed several retaining walls along the periphery to ensure that these retaining walls do not encroach upon individual owned lots. Extending the end lot lines to align with the edge of the property line would result in the retaining walls falling within the boundaries of the individual lots. However, to prevent the burden of ownership and maintenance falling on individual homeowners, the end lots have been reduced in size and the homeowners association (HOA) will assume responsibility for the ownership and upkeep of the retaining walls.

3l. (Site Plan Sheet 3) The units facing east are "half" of a green court. The expectation for compliance with green court standards is that the green court open space area be at least 17' from property line to building face (half of the building height). A landscape buffer is not required (see landscaping comments); however, the plant material should remain and act to provide visual buffering between the two residential properties. A majority (at least 50%) of the green court open space area shall be usable common open space. Staff is concerned that there is not enough space to accommodate the open space, plant material, sidewalk, and required 17' green court. Narrowing vehicular space between garages to more traditional alley widths may be part of an approach to add width to green courts to better meet width and usability requirements.

Response: The eastern most facing green court has now been programmed to provide residents with a community gathering and seating space. The green court has also been widen to 17' in width to meet the required dimension.

3m. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Change distance measurement for green courts to building face to building face, typical on all green courts.

Response: Acknowledged.

3n. (Site Plan Sheet 4) See previous comments regarding the usability of the green court space considering infrastructure (appears minimal given the underground detention shown) and the significant grading.

Response: All green courts are now programmed with a variety of passive and active recreation spaces. The grade change within each green court is now minimal and has been revised since the last submittal. The applicant has spoken to planning staff about the proposed green court programming and believe the direction is beneficial for the project.



3s. (Site Plan Sheet 6) All green court units shall have front entry porches or stoops with a minimum 45 s.f. area; 5' wide in the narrowest dimension. Please illustrate these items to comply with this requirement.

Response: The applicant is seeking an adjustment to this requirement. Taking into account the numerous constraints associated with the infill condition of this project, we have made deliberate efforts to prioritize the well-being and satisfaction of the residents by designing larger and more functional green courts. These green courts serve as essential communal spaces, providing additional amenities that enhance the overall living experience within the development.

However, one particular challenge arose when considering the incorporation of porches or stoops on the first level of each townhome. While these features may offer certain advantages, such as a welcoming entrance or outdoor seating area, they would also lead to a reduction in the size of the green courts and an increase in the overall lot size. Recognizing the importance of preserving the spaciousness and functionality of the green courts, we have devised a mitigation measure to address this concern.

To strike a balance between providing desirable features and maintaining the integrity of the green courts, we have introduced balconies on the second and third levels of each townhome. These balconies have been strategically positioned to overlook the green courts, offering residents an elevated vantage point to enjoy the surrounding greenery and foster a sense of connection with nature. By locating the balconies on higher levels, we not only preserve the size of the green courts but also create an elevated outdoor space that adds an element of privacy and tranquility for the residents. The balconies serve as an excellent alternative to porches or stoops, ensuring that the townhome units still have outdoor spaces where residents can unwind, socialize, and enjoy the views. Additionally, the balconies provide an opportunity for residents to personalize their living spaces with plants, seating arrangements, and other personal touches.

By incorporating these balconies as a thoughtful mitigation measure, we maintain the integrity and usability of the green courts while simultaneously offering residents an appealing outdoor space that complements their lifestyle. Our aim is to create a harmonious blend of functional green spaces and individualized townhome units, fostering a sense of community while respecting the unique preferences and needs of each resident.

3s. (Site Plan Sheet 8-9) Typical for green court plant material: trees may be located in green court areas but should be canopy trees to allow usable space under the canopy.

Response: The landscape design was revised to include a combination of trees providing both screening and canopy, to allow use of the open space under the canopy. Further, trees are located along the periphery of the open spaces affording a more open air and usable space for passive recreation.

4a. (Site Plan Sheet 2) To reduce site constraints, Planning would be in support of reducing the width of the alley if permitted by Fire/Life Safety, Civil, Traffic Engineering and Aurora Water.





Response: The size of the alley cannot be decreased to minimum size requirements from Fire and Life Safety.

4b. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Add a north/south crosswalk. If guest parking is to be removed, one central crosswalk may be added.

Response: Guest parking will not be removed and as a result no crosswalk will be added.

4c. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Provide crosswalk to connect an east/west pedestrian route.

Response: An east/west side walk connection is provided on the northern and southern boundary of the site.

4d. (Site Plan Sheet 3) If all walks are the same width, please add the width to the legend. If not, please label the width on the plan.

Response: Width of the walks are below the corresponding keynote unless the width varies.

5a. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Guest parking is only required for green court configurations that preclude street connectivity on both ends of the green court. This lot configuration does have street connectivity on the ends of all green courts; guest parking is not required. Please revise the parking space requirement to 140.

Response: Acknowledged. Parking count has been revised.

5b. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Amend the calculation as necessary ($70 \times 2 = 140$).

Response: Acknowledged. The language has been updated.

5c. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Accessible spaces are not required for single-family attached dwellings (multifamily and non-residential uses only). Please revise the requirement to 0. Any accessible spaces provided may remain and be counted in the accessible spaces provided row.

Response: Acknowledged. The language has been updated.

5d. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Bicycle parking spaces are not required but are highly encouraged. Please reduce the required amount to 0. Any bicycle parking provided may remain.

Response: Acknowledged. The language has been updated.

5e. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Label bike racks, typical on all sheets.

Response: Acknowledged. Additional labels have been added.





6a. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Building height shown on the elevations is 34'.

Response: All building heights have been dimensioned on elevations.

6b. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Label the existing or proposed fence. Include the height and material.

Response: 6' Vinyl Fence.

6c. (Site Plan Sheet 16) EIFS is not a permitted building material. It shall be 3-coat stucco, typical for all elevations.

Response: EIFS note has been removed and changed to a 3-coat stucco system.

6d. (Site Plan Sheet 16) Provide a materials board (electronic is preferred) with your next submittal.

Response: Thin Brick Veneer / Cementitious Board Siding / 3 Coat Stucco System electronic samples have been provided in a separate document.

6e. (Site Plan Sheet 16) Call out railing material on all elevations.

Response: Railing material has been called out on all elevations.

6f. (Site Plan Sheet 16) Typical for all plans: Provide a calculation of the masonry amount as a net facade area (not each elevation) to comply with Table 4.8-6. Single-family attached shall have either:

- 50% clad in brick or stone
- 75% clad in stucco
- 75% clad in combination of stucco and brick, or stucco and stone.

Response: Material percentage legend has been added to all elevations.

6g. (Site Plan Sheet 16) Include maximum building height to parapet.

Response: All building heights have been dimensioned on elevations.

6h. (Site Plan Sheet 16) Call out this material, typical on all elevations.

Response: All materials have been called out on all elevations.

6i. (Site Plan Sheet 16) There should be a window on each elevation.

Response: A window has been provided on each elevation.

6j. (Site Plan Sheet 17) EIFS is not a permitted building material. It shall be 3-coat stucco.





Response: EIFS note has been removed and changed to a 3-coat stucco system.

6k. (Site Plan Sheet 17) Provide a calculation of the masonry amount as a net facade area (not each elevation) to comply with Table 4.8-6. Single-family attached shall have either:

- 50% clad in brick or stone
- 75% clad in stucco
- 75% clad in combination of stucco and brick, or stucco and stone.

Response: Material percentage legend has been added to all elevations.

6l. (Site Plan Sheet 17) There should be a window on each elevation.

Response: A window has been provided on each elevation.

6m. (Site Plan Sheet 18) This elevation is not applicable. There are no 6 unit buildings shown on the site plan.

Response: Sheet has been removed from drawing set.

7a. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Add signage to the data block as applicable.

Response: Acknowledged. The information has been added.

7b. (Site Plan Sheet 13) Internal pedestrian paths and bicycle paths shall be lit and provide consistent illumination of at least one foot candle on the walking surface. Additional SB fixtures should be utilized along pedestrian paths and adjacent to bicycle racks.

Response: Acknowledged.

7c. (Site Plan Sheet 13) Provide a symbol for SA and SB so they are easier to find on the plan.

Response: Acknowledged. The locations on the plan are shown as SA and SB, respectively.

7d. (Site Plan Sheet 13) For fixtures facing east on these end units, please ensure that the building-mounted lighting is mounted low enough on the building to reduce glare onto adjacent properties. Adjust spot lighting levels as necessary.

Response: Acknowledged. No modifications to the lighting levels was realized with this change.

7e. (Site Plan Sheet 14) Remove uplight from mounting options as uplighting is not permitted.

Response: All elevations have been updated.

7f. (Site Plan Sheet 16) Typical for all buildings. Show and label all building-mounted light fixtures on each elevation.

Response: All elevations have been updated.





8a. (Site Plan Sheet 5) Please clarify if all the area in the DE's is underground with the exception of the drainage inlets and there is no above-ground concrete.

Response: The only items that are on the surface is manhole lids and inlets.

8c. (Site Plan Sheet 6) Please indicate and label all the proposed retaining walls on the landscape plans.

Response: Proposed retaining walls are now labeled on the landscape plan, with note to "see engineering plans".

8d. (Site Plan Sheet 8-9) Please turn off the interior building details for all the buildings on all sheets (TYPICAL).

Response: Floor plans for bldg. interiors have been turned off.

8e. (Site Plan Sheet 8-9) Please label the trees and correct the labels per the redlines.

Response: Label to trees have been added and corrected.

8f. (Site Plan Sheet 8-9) Please provide shade for all the benches or move the benches to the proposed trees (TYPICAL).

Response: Shade has been provided to all green court benches.

8g. (Site Plan Sheet 8-9) Please indicate and label all the proposed or existing stop signs and provide the required 50' clearance from a tree. (TYPICAL).

Response: Stop sign location on Montview has been added and verified that tree clear zone is minimum of 50ft.

8h. (Site Plan Sheet 8-9) Please screen the electrical box and lift station.

Response: stop sign location on Montview has been added and verified that tree clear zone is minimum of 50ft.

8j. (Site Plan Sheet 8-9) Please indicate and label all the proposed DE on the landscape plans in the green courts. NOTE: Please obtain approval from the City to allow any trees in the DE green courts on the landscape plans. (TYPICAL).

Response: Acknowledged.

8k. (Site Plan Sheet 10) Please clarify the 8' wide Curbside landscaping, as the site plan has 7.5'. As such, please recheck and have them both concur to the code requirements.

Response: We have confirmed with Julis Bingham that 7.5' is corrected as shown.





8l. (Site Plan Sheet 10) Please provide the % as well as the SF for the water requirement exhibit items.

Response: Square footage and percentage is now shown on exhibit table.

9a. Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for addressing and other GIS mapping purposes. Include the parcel, street line, easement and building footprint 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. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Please contact me if you need additional information about this digital file.

Response: Acknowledged. A CAD file will be provided.

Civil Engineering Comments:

10a. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Add the following required site plan note:

"Errors in approved Site Plans resulting from computations or inconsistencies in the drawings made by the applicant are the responsibility of the property owner of record. Where found, the current minimum Code requirements will apply at the time of building permit. Please be sure that all plan computations are correct."

Response: Acknowledged. Note has been added.

10b. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Provide curb ramps on both sides of the intersection. It is recommended to work with the developer to the north regarding a potential cost-share option.

Response: North receiving ramp is to be designed and constructed with the development to the north.

10c. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Provide section details for 21st and Montview. 21st should be a local type 2 and Montview should be a local type 3. Clearly identify the responsibilities of this development. Coordination is encouraged with the development to the north regarding 21st.

Response: Acknowledged. Sections have been added.

10d. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Please add the following note:

"Proposed street light locations are conceptual. Final locations will be determined with photometric analysis submitted with the street lighting plans in the civil plan submittal."

Response: Acknowledged. Note has been added.

10e. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Streetlights are required along all public streets. Please show them on all sheets.





Response: Acknowledged. Lights are now shown.

10f. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Label all inside and outside fire lane radii, typical.

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

10g. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Should be 8' curbside landscaping.

Response: We have confirmed with Julis Bingham that 7.5' is corrected as shown.

10h. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Update the existing ramp to be directional on the other side of the intersection.

Response: Acknowledged. A new ramp has been added.

10i. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Add a label to the entrances pointing to the detail provided on the detail sheet.

Response: Acknowledged. A note has been added to each sheet.

10j. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Identify the limits of the street improvements in plan view. Show where the asphalt is being replaced/added.

Response: Acknowledged. The saw cut limits has been added to the Grading & Utility Plans.

10k. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Ensure the proposed transition meets taper requirements. Please show the full extent of the transition on this plan.

Response: It is at a typical 15:1 taper.

10l. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Typical: label all slopes down to public streets. Max 4% down to public streets, max 6% up to public streets

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

10m. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Minimum 2' of clearance from ROW and property lines, typical all walls.

Response: Acknowledged. The ROW Line has been adjusted.

10n. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Per section 4.02.7.05.7 of the Roadway Manual, if the horizontal distance between terraced walls is less than twice the height of the lower wall, then the entire wall shall be considered to act as one wall. The max height of any wall in a residential area is 4'. Minimum 8' between terraced walls in order for the walls to be considered separate.

Response: Acknowledged. A Variance Request to allow wall heights greater than the maximum allowed within residential areas and for a reduction in the horizontal distance between terraced walls was submitted to and is under review by the City Engineer.



10o. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Add slope labels across the site indicating conformance with the following:

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

10p. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Minimum slope away from the building is 5% for 10' for landscape areas, minimum 2% for impervious areas.

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

10q. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Minimum pavement slopes: 1% for asphalt, 0.5% for concrete.

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

10r. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Minimum 2% in unpaved areas.

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

10s. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Max 4% cross slope in fire lane easements.

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

10t. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Max 3:1 slopes.

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

10u. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Label the longitudinal slopes in the alleys, typical.

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

10v. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Only 5' of ROW along Sable is required per the pre-app notes.

A sidewalk easement would be required to be dedicated for the sidewalk outside of the ROW, set back 0.5' behind the back of walk. Shifting the ROW as identified above may help with required clearance from ROW to walls.

Response: Acknowledged. The ROW line has been adjusted and a Sidewalk Easement has been added.

10w. (Site Plan Sheet 6) Label the longitudinal slopes in the alleys, typical.

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

10x. (Site Plan Sheet 14) Why isn't this proposed on the north side of the street? Please relocate.

Response: To match all of the existing streetlights along Montview which are on the south side.

10y. (Site Plan Sheet 14) Please review section 2.12.0.1 of the 2023 Roadway Manual and identify the required information regarding public streetlights on the photometric plan.



Response: Acknowledged.

10z. (Site Plan Sheet 14) Streetlights on local streets shall be SL-1.

Response: Acknowledged.

10aa. (Site Plan Sheet 14) Streetlights on collector streets shall be SL-3.

Response: Acknowledged.

10bb. (Site Plan Sheet 15) The public streetlights shall use fixtures and poles from the pre-approved fixture list: https://cdnsm5-hosted.civiclive.com/UserFiles/Servers/Server_1881137/File/Business%20Services/Development%20Center/Code%20&%20Rules/Design%20Standard/Engineering%20Design%20Standard/LightingEquipment.pdf

Poles for SL-1 shall be 20' height and poles for SL-3 shall be 30' height.

Response: Acknowledged.

10cc. (Subdivision Plat) Only 5' of ROW along Sable Blvd is required per the Pre-App Notes. A sidewalk easement can be dedicated for the sidewalk outside of the ROW, setback 0.5' behind the back of walk.

Response: Acknowledged. The ROW line has been adjusted and a Sidewalk Easement has been added.

Traffic Engineering Comments:

11a. (TIS) Signal Warrant analysis for 8 hours not provided. Need 8 hours shown meeting the volume requirements. Also, 2040 background growth traffic is not matching the 25 compounded out 18 years.

Response: Signal warrant analysis was initially conducted for Warrant 1 – Eight-Hour. TIS has been updated to include documentation on volumes used in conducting the eight-hour warrant. 2040 background traffic was initially calculated using 2% growth over 20 years. Volumes have been updated to reflect 2% growth over 18 years.

11b. (TIS) $674 \times 1.02^{18} = 963$, where is other 48 coming from?



Response: Analysis was initially conducted using 2% growth rate compounded over 20 years. Analysis has been updated to now represent 2% growth rate over 18 years.

11c. (TIS) 2% compounded out 18 years is 1.43. Values calculated here are higher than that computation.

Response: Comment acknowledged. Analysis updated to reflect using 2% growth rate compounded over 18 years.

11d. (TIS) Need to provide hourly volume numbers to show if 8 hours of daily traffic will be warranted in the future.

Response: Hourly volumes used in Warrant Analyses added to Appendix D.

11e. (TIS) Documentation not provided as explained previously.

Response: As previously mentioned, additional documentation has been added to show the volumes which were used to conduct Warrants 1 and 2. If additional documentation is requested, please clarify.

11f. (TIS) Provide unsignalized analysis results unless warrant analysis is provided.

Response: Both signalized and unsignalized analysis results were included for the Sable Boulevard and Montview Boulevard intersection under Year 2024 traffic conditions. Year 2040 conditions only show signalized conditions as it is noted that the intersection exceeded vehicle volume thresholds to meet Warrant 1 in the long-term.

11g. (TIS) A minimum of 8 hours has to meet these values. No hourly volume chart is provided to prove warrant is met in 2040 period.

Response: Volume table added to updated TIS to show volumes used for Warrants 1 and 2.

11h. (TIS) Only 3 of 4 hours met.

Response: Comment acknowledged. Warrant 2 is not met under any analysis scenarios.

11i. (TIS) Still only 3 of 4 hours met.

Response: Comment acknowledged. Warrant 2 is not met under any analysis scenarios.

11j. (Site Plan Sheet 2) A receiving ramp is needed in the location shown.

Response: West facing ramp has been removed as a crosswalk in this area of Sable is not safe without a traffic light.





11k. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Label the existing stop signs.

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

11l. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Provide sight triangles per COA TE-13.

Response: Acknowledged. Sight line have been added.

11m. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Provide the new stop sign.

Response: Acknowledged. A new sign has been added.

11n. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Add the street name signs in the locations shown.

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

11o. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Graphic scale is incorrect, is 20-scale.

Response: Acknowledged. Scale has been corrected.

11p. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Sight triangles are needed. Please see the redlines for locations.

Response: Acknowledged. Sight line have been added.

11q. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Stop signs and street name signs are needed. See the redlines for locations.

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

11r. (Site Plan Sheet 6) Reference COA TE-11 detail (sign posts).

Response: Acknowledged. Detail reference has been added.

11s. (Site Plan Sheet 8) Tree trunks need to be 6-ft minimum from edge of traveled way on Sable. Provide dimensions and adjust if needed.

Response: Trees on Sable have been shifted to be 6ft from edge of travel lane. Dimension has been added.

11t. (Site Plan Sheet 9) The tree cannot be within 50-ft of stop signs per TE standards in Roadway Manual.

Response: Tree is 50ft. from stop sign



Fire/Life Safety Comments:

12a. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Please justify the number of accessible parking spaces relative to the amount of accessible units on the property.

Response: The garage spaces are ADA accessible also per Plannings comment, ADA Spaces aren't even required.

12b. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Please indicate if the proposed project is intended to be phased.

Kephart Response: The project will not be a phased development.

12c. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Please provide the data table and note (see redlines) to reflect the manner in which the accessibility requirements of both the IBC and HB-1221 will be met within this site.

Response: Implementation plan has been provided on the SDP cover sheet.

12d. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Show the accessible route on all sheets and terminate at the public way, typical.

Response: Acknowledged. Routes have been updated where they are inteneded to connect to the public way.

12e. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Show on the drawings the locations of all fire lane signs that comply with the provided graphics.

Response: Only one type of Fire Lane sign is needed.

12f. (Site Plan Sheet 2) Where fire lane signs are shown, provide a 30-to-45-degree angle to oncoming traffic.

Response: Acknowledged. Signs have been updated.

12g. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Show the accessible route on all sheets and terminate at the public way, typical.

Response: Acknowledged. Routes have been updated where they are inteneded to connect to the public way.



12i. (Site Plan Sheet 3) Show on the plans how the accessible parking in the garages will provide persons with disabilities access to the units. Through the interior of the garage or a route on the exterior of the garage around to the front door of each unit.

Response: There will be no accessible parking within the garage. Only the visitable ground floor from the front entry will be accessible.

12k. (Site Plan Sheet 3) See the note on the redlines regarding the implementation plan.

Response: Implementation plan has been provided on the SDP cover sheet.

12l. (Site Plan Sheet 5) Propose a fire hydrant at the locations shown. See the redlines on the sheet.

Response: The location we are showing is per Mike Dean and he only requested 1 hydrant to be added.

12n. (Site Plan Sheet 7) Please add fire hydrants to the street section details using the typical fire hydrant placement detail shown on the redlined sheet.

Response: Acknowledged. Hydrants are shown on the sections.

12o. (Site Plan Sheet 7) A 5-foot clear space shall be maintained around the circumference of fire hydrants.

Response: Noted.

12s. (Site Plan Sheet 16) Provide an elevation detail for the front door entrance to the accessible units.

Response: Elevation has been provided for accessible units, see sheet 5/A201.

Aurora Water Comments:

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

Response: Noted.

13b. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Please provide the email thread where the approval of this meter pit configuration was provided with the next submittal.

Response: The approved meter pit locations were approved in a virtual meeting with Aurora water.





13c. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Discuss with the PDR reviewer if this discharge location is acceptable.

Response: Will do.

13d. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Is this the correct label?

Response: No it wasn't, it has been corrected.

13e. (Site Plan Sheet 4) What do these linetypes indicate?

Response: Lintypes have been added to the legend.

13f. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Existing water meter must be removed and capped at the main.

Response: Acknowledged. The label has been updated.

13g. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Label all connections to existing water and sanitary mains.

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

13h. (Site Plan Sheet 4) Show ROW limits (TYP).

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

13i. (Site Plan Sheet 5) Show main size.

Response: Acknowledged. Labels have been added.

13j. (Site Plan Sheet 5) Consider tying this main to the existing manhole.

Response: We are looking into it.

13k. (Site Plan Sheet 5) Provide these notes:

- “1) Water service lines are public up through the meter and are private downstream of the meter.
- 2) All sanitary service connections are private.”

Response: Acknowledged. Notes have been added.

13l. (Site Plan Sheet 9) No shrubs and plantings are allowed within 5 ft of water meters.

Response: Noted.



Forestry Comments:

14a. (Site Plan Sheet 7) There may be trees impacted by redevelopment of this site, specifically on the east side of the adjacent property. We are requesting that you send a certified letter to the adjacent property indicating the methods used to protect these trees, as well as remedies as a result of potential damage incurred from the development. Please provide the City of Aurora a copy of this letter including the date sent and received.

Response: A letter was sent to the adjacent property owner and a copy of the letter has been sent and received by Planning and Forestry.

PROS Comments:

15a. (Site Plan Sheet 1) General comments from PROS regarding updated 2023 land dedication and development fees are included below. As a reminder, cash-in-lieu of land dedication is due prior to plat approval and recording, and park development fees are due per unit at the time of building permit issuance.

Response: Acknowledged.

15b. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Cash-in-lieu of Land Dedication:

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

Response: Acknowledged.

15c. (Site Plan Sheet 1) Park Development Fees:

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

Response: Acknowledged.

Land Development Services Comments:

16a. See redline comments on Subdivision Plat and Site Plan.

Response: Noted.

16b. Provide certificate of taxes due showing all taxes are paid in full.





Response: A certificate of taxes will be provided at a later date per our conversation with Maurice Brooks.

16c. Provide Title Commitment dated within 30 days of plat approval date.

Response: Acknowledged. A updated title commitment will be provided at a later date.

Revenue Department Comments:

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

Response: Acknowledged.

Aurora Public Schools Comments:

18a. In accordance with Section 4.3.18 of the Unified Development Ordinance, the school land dedication obligation for the 70 townhome units is .4603 acres. The proposed development will replace one residential unit previously located in the development area. The difference between the school land obligation for the current development and what would be required based on the one unit the project is replacing is .4439 acres. Aurora Public Schools will accept cash-in-lieu of land for the 0.4439 acre obligation valued at market value of zoned land with infrastructure in place. Cash-in-lieu is due prior to plat approval.

Response: Acknowledged.

18a. See the student yield table.

Response: Acknowledged.

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

Sincerely,

Jeff Neulieb

KEPHART



community ■ planning ■ architecture



2555 Walnut Street, Denver, CO 80205 303.832.4474 fax 303.832.4476 www.kephart.com