

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



May 8, 2023

Roger Prusse  
Prusse Development  
9162 S Lost Hill Trail  
Lone Tree, CO 80124

**Re: Initial Submission Review – The Overlook at Kings Point South – Zoning Map Amendment and Master Plan**  
Application Number: **DA-1628-08**  
Case Numbers: **2023-2004-00, 2023-7003-00**

Dear Mr. Prusse.

Thank you for your initial submission, which we started to review 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 Planning Commission Hearing date for the zoning map amendment only is set for June 14, 2023. Your estimated Administrative Decision date for the master plan is tentatively 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 hearing and decision dates. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause your hearing or 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](mailto:egates@auroragov.org).

Sincerely,

Erik Gates  
Planner

cc: Julie Gamec, THK Associates INC.  
Cesarina Dancy, ODA  
Filed: K:\SDA\1600-1699\1628-08rev1



## Initial Submission Review

### SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Outstanding development review fees totaling **\$46,047.74** have yet to be paid. This will need to be addressed before we can accept a second review.
- Residential densities for the R-1 zone district appear to be exceeded in several planning areas and will need to be reduced. [Planning]
- Sod is not permitted in the front yards of single family homes. Please refer to the UDO standards for front yard landscaping requirements. [Landscaping]
- In general, don't assume infrastructure will be provided by a different planning area. Identify the minimum required improvements for each planning area to develop independently. In particular, identify the road connections out to the future Aurora Parkway. [Civil Engineering]
- There are a number of questions related to traffic volumes both with and without the Pine Drive extension that are asked in the Traffic Impact Study. [Traffic Engineering]
- The plan must clearly state and show how the two separate points of access will be established. If access is reliant on adjacent site, the plan must identify the contingent requirements. [Fire/Life Safety]
- Due to the nature of this MUS being dependent on the Sanford property for water and sewer, please note that delays may be possible while Aurora Water is coordinating comments in regards to the Sanford MUS. Please continue efforts with the Sanford development to ensure the most up to date information is presented in this MUS. [Aurora Water]
- The current (2023) public art fee per residential acre is \$381.13, not \$282.57. [Public Art]
- Please see the attached comment letter from Xcel Energy and Douglas County. You will need to have a discussion with Douglas County regarding the buildout of Pine Drive.

### PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

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

- 1A. (Kari Dickson / 303-981-3407 / [k.anderson42@icloud.com](mailto:k.anderson42@icloud.com)): I am very concerned with these plans. You cannot put such a densely populated neighborhood in a place where the homes will be surrounded by rural properties and roads and not create a traffic issue. Will these homes have access to the small, 2-lane road though the Travois neighborhood (Ireland/Travois Trl)? We already have a problem with people using that street as a shortcut and speeding through our neighborhood. Not to mention the traffic problems we already have on Inspiration/Pine as it is.
- We also have bridle trails that the Travois homeowners personally maintain; what will be put in place to prevent this new development from having access to our trail? Or will thousands of people (who have no rights to our trails) now have access to them?
- Is there any chance of putting in a development that resembles the area around it? Fewer homes, with more open space. We have SO much wildlife that comes through that plot of land, with an already skyrocketing population, I think Parker can do without cramming in fabricated homes into every open bit of land.
- I would like to know more about this application, and if there is anything we can do to fight it, or amend it, or something.

#### 2. Application Completeness and Clarity (Erik Gates / 303-739-7132 / [egates@auroragov.org](mailto:egates@auroragov.org) / Comments in Teal)

[Tab 1 Page 2]

- 2A. In addition to what has been mentioned by Landscaping, this letter should also specifically address the Criteria for Approval for a Master Plan found in [Section 146-5.4.1.E.3](#).

[Tab 1 Page 4]

- 2B. This agreement and the legal descriptions are not really part of the Letter of Introduction and should be uploaded separately in future submissions as supporting documents.

[Tab 3 Page 2]

- 2C. These two patterns are too close, please change one.



[Tab 6 Page 5]

- 2D. Coordination with outside agencies may be needed in the future based on the comments that are received from these agencies during review. Currently, a discussion with Douglas County is needed regarding the future extension of Pine Drive.

[Tab 7 Page 4]

- 2E. This Black Forest Ordinance language needs to be coordinated with city Forestry.

[Tab 10 Page 2]

- 2F. Typo here.

### **3. Zoning and Land Use Comments**

[Tab 1 Page 2]

- 3A. Not accurate. Currently there is a small corner of R-2 zoning in the northwest portion of this site. This may only be an issue if the zone district boundary results in a lot split between two zone districts.

[Tab 8 Page 2]

- 3B. The maximum density in R-1 zoning is 3 DU/ac. As a result, each of these PA's (1-4) are over density.

- 3C. Show the R-1/R-2 zone district boundary on this map. It appears to occur somewhere around here.

[Tab 8 Page 3]

- 3D. See the comment on the previous page regarding R-1 maximum density.

### **4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues**

[Tab 9 Page 2]

- 4A. The expectation is Pine drive to be extended from the south line.

- 4B. The Street Network typically only describes Collectors and Arterial and not local streets. The expectation is for a collector network to be present.

[Tab 10 Page 4]

- 4C. This diagram should show only the collector street network.

- 4D. This area may need to be amended to reflect the final resolution of Pine Drive.

[Tab 11 Page 12]

- 4E. You will need to organize all local streets so that each lot may be accessed by traveling over no more than two (2) local streets after departing from the grid of arterial or collector roads. There are currently areas that clearly would require travel over 3 local streets. The simplest way to correct this appears to be converting this road (highlighted) into a collector street.

### **5. Parking Issues**

- 5A. There were no Parking comments on this review.

### **6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues**

[Tab 8 Page 2]

- 6A. Per the UDO, each residential subdivision that contains more than 40 gross acres but less than 160 gross acres of land shall include lots from at least two different lot size categories described in [Section 146-4.3.10.F.1.C](#), and at least 10 percent of the residential lots shall be in each size category. Provide a table/description of the lot types listing the number of lots proposed for these categories.

[Tab 10 Page 3]

- 6B. In the case of any conflict between these standards and the UDO the stricter will apply unless an adjustment was approved by Planning Commission.

[Tab 10 Page 11]

- 6C. Where are these fencing types anticipated? A solid base fence would only be allowed for individual lot fencing if it is in the front yard and the base is no taller than 18".

- 6D. Make a note of the UDO fence height standards. I.E. 6 ft maximum for privacy fences in side and rear yards, 42 in for front yard fences, and 4 ft for park adjacent fencing.

- 6E. Fencing allowed adjacent to open tracts, trails, and parks needs to be shown here as well as these fencing types will not count. Open space fencing should be a 3-rail fence with welded wire mesh at a maximum of 4 ft tall.



[Tab 10 Page 12]

6F. Please avoid restating regulations.

[Tab 11 Page 14]

6G. We want to try to avoid restating regulations. We are happy to discuss this prior to the next submittal.

### **7. Signage Issues**

7A. There were no signage issues identified in this review.

### **8. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / [kbish@auroragov.org](mailto:kbish@auroragov.org) / Comments in bright teal)**

[Initial Zoning]

8A. This information should be added to the buffer graphic in Tab 11, Landscape Tab.

[Tab 1 Page 2]

8B. This talks a lot about location, but not about the product types being proposed and any amenities/parks proposed etc., or the proposed development in general. There appear to be two duplicative first pages with this letter of introduction.

[Tab 1 Page 3]

8C. This was taken from the PIP. This is the essence of what the Letter of Introduction needs to include and the context map needs to reflect more precisely this development's location relative to the other phases of the development and streets that are surrounding the overall community.

[Tab 3 Page 2]

8D. Have a second page to show the actual context of the site relative to the rest of Kings Point South/Prairie Point. This map doesn't really identify where the site is as there are no major roads included.

[Tab 8 Page 4]

8E. Add "conflict"

8F. Add "the"

[Tab 10 Page 4]

8G. Will there be both primary and secondary monumentation? If so, identify where those may occur on the monument map.

[Tab 11 Page 8]

8H. This has nothing to do with buffers. This should just state that these open space areas shall be buffered.

8I. These two thoughts seem to overlap.

[Tab 11 Page 9]

8J. What is a substation buffer? How wide is it?

8K. What are the proposed residential uses going to abut?

[Tab 12 Page 18]

8L. This information should be moved to Tab 11.

8M. Sod is not permitted in the front yards of single-family homes.

8N. Please refer to the UDO standards for front yard requirements. These should be met at a minimum and then additional conditions can be imposed.

8O. City Council passed an ordinance in September of 2022 prohibiting the installation of turf for non-functional purposes and this includes front yards, as well as curbside landscape areas.

### **9. Transportation Planning (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7340 / [tworker@auroragov.org](mailto:tworker@auroragov.org) / Comments in light blue)**

9A. There were no comments from Transportation Planning on this review.



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

### **10. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham/ 303-739-7403 / [jbingham@auroragov.org](mailto:jbingham@auroragov.org) / Comments in green)**

[Tab 9 Page 2]

10A. Show Aurora Parkway on this exhibit.

[Tab 10 Page 2]

10B. Add: Walls over 30" require a railing.

[Tab 10 Page 10]

10C. Add: Paving with City of Aurora Right of Way shall meet COA standards.

[PIP Overall]

10D. Remove the identified paragraphs throughout.

[PIP Page 7]

10E. Where was this cost-sharing agreement provided?

10F. Aurora Parkway would still be required prior to the development of any planning area. This is identified on the exhibits, but please include it here as well.

Is the full length from Kings Point Drive to Heritage Eagle Bend being required per the master plan? Identify the limits.

[PIP Page 8]

10G. Remove this note everywhere it occurs. If desired, it can be replaced with "Final location of street trees will be dependent upon the final location of the driveways, curb cuts and utilities."

[PIP Page 10]

10H. Should this say Planning Area 2?

[PIP Page 11]

10I. In general, don't assume infrastructure will be provided by a different planning area. Identify the minimum required improvements for each planning area to develop independently. (typical all planning areas).

[PIP Page 12]

10J. Include Aurora Parkway as a requirement for PA-3.

10K. Don't assume that planning area 1 will provide the connection. Identify the required roads to connect out to Aurora Parkway.

10L. Where is S. Quartar Ct?

[PIP Page 13]

10M. Include Aurora Parkway as a requirement for PA-4.

[PIP Page 14]

10N. Include Aurora Parkway as a requirement for PA-5.

[PIP Page 21]

10O. Offsite street improvements required in order to provide a second point of access shall be completed prior to the issuance of certification of occupancies for any planning areas.

10P. Please remove the on-street bike lane from the 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 22]

10Q. The narrative mentions that the second point of access is being provided through Prairie Point, how is that going to be accommodated?

[PIP Page 23]

10R. The narrative indicates a connection to Aurora Parkway and through Kings Point North. How will this be provided?

10S. Remove sizing, typical.

10T. There is a typo here.

[PIP Pages 24-26]

10U. How will this planning area connect to Aurora Parkway? Identify the required roads.

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

[Tab 8 Page 2]

11A. Label access to Aurora Parkway.

[Tab 9 Page 2]

11B. Show entryway extension to Aurora Parkway or label access from Aurora Parkway.

11C. Label all site accesses as a full movement.

[PIP Page 7]

11D. Include Overlook per TIS.

11E. Update text consistent with TIS.

[PIP Page 22]

11F. Label all Overlook access points to adjacent street network and on Aurora Parkway, typical.

11G. Label as Overlook access with connection to Aurora Parkway, typical.

[TIS Page 1]

11H. The buildout year is 2027. Why not 2030, consistent with the buildout for Prairie Point (Kings Point North).

11I. Verify background traffic volumes with/without Pine Dr extension. Update as necessary.

11J. 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.

11K. Add Traffic signal warrant evaluation section.

11L. See comments throughout the report.

[TIS Page 6]

11M. Why not 2030, consistent with the buildout for Prairie Point (Kings Point North)

[TIS Page 7]

11N. Add including the Overlook.

[TIS Page 12]

11O. Add delay for the signalized results and unsignalized critical movements. overall unsignalized intersection results not needed typical.

11P. By what year 2027, 2040?

[TIS Page 14]

11Q. 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 16]

11R. Add delay for the signalized and roundabout results and unsignalized critical movements. overall unsignalized intersection results not needed typical.

[TIS Page 20]

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

[TIS Page 21]

11T. Add signal warrant evaluation and discussion of Pine Dr/Inspiration and Pine Dr/Aurora Parkway.

11U. Provide signal warrant evaluation and discussion.

[TIS Page 32]

11V. Highlighted is not consistent with Kings Point (Prairie Point) MTIS.

11W. 95%, typ.

[TIS Page 35]

11X. Typo: Aurora.

[TIS Pages 41-42]

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

[TIS Page 53]

11Z. Fix this identified on the page.

**12. Fire / Life Safety (Richard Tenorio / 303-739-7628 / [rtenorio@auroragov.org](mailto:rtenorio@auroragov.org) / Comments in blue)**

[Tab 3 Page 2]

- 12A. This appears to be the only location for access into The Overlook at Kings Point South. Provide information showing the 2nd point for emergency access into the proposed subdivision.
- 12B. 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 as a portion of The Overlook at Kings Point South.

[Tab 8 Page 2]

- 12C. The proposed location for the Whelan Siren Location shall be submitted for review, approval, and permit by the City of Aurora.

[Tab 8 Page 4]

- 12D. It appears the second point of access is dependent upon the adjacent site, the Vistas. If so, please show and delineate how the Vistas second point of access will meet the minimum access requirements. Provide an illustration showing required access extending beyond the proposed sites.

[PIP Page 5]

- 12E. Add the following note:  
"A looped water supply, two separate and approved points of access to the overall development and each individual phase of development."

[PIP Page 6]

- 12F. Question: Will the water infrastructure in both Kings Point North (Prairie Point) and The Vistas at Kings Point South be complete and capable of providing looped water to The Overlook at Kings Point South?

[PIP Page 7]

- 12G. The plan must clearly state and show how the two separate points of access will be established. They must demonstrate how this site intends on meeting this requirement. If access is reliant on adjacent sites, the plan must identify the contingent requirements.

[PIP Page 9]

- 12H. The required two points of access must meet all Fire Life Safety requirements such as "remoteness", as identified in the 2015 IFC Appendix D. Also, the access points need to be through the City of Aurora's jurisdiction. For example, E Aurora Pkwy from S Parker Rd is the primary point of access with the secondary access from E Aurora Pkwy from S Ireland Way. Additional details for the overall site and each individual planning area shall be provided to demonstrate how you intend to meet minimum access and water requirements for the overall site.

[PIP Page 14]

- 12I. Question: Will this connection through The Vistas at KPS be constructed as a 2nd emergency access to The Overlook at KPS.

[PIP Page 21]

- 12J. Overall Requirements: two points of paved emergency access, looped water supply and all off-site roadways necessary to provide the two distinct points of access to the overall site.

[PIP Page 22]

- 12K. Label all Overlook access points to adjacent street network and on Aurora Parkway, typical.
- 12L. Provide more information regarding the water infrastructure in Kings Point North (Prairie Point) with only one water main connection. Construction of The Overlook at Kings Point South is contingent on the capability of the mains in Prairie Point to provide water.

[PIP Page 23]

- 12M. Each plan needs to provide specific information detailing how the two points of paved emergency access, looped water supply and all off-site roadways necessary to provide the two distinct points of access to the overall site.

[PIP Page 24]

- 12N. Provide information that details how these lines will not be a dead end water lines and show interconnection to other water mains.

[PIP Page 26]

- 12O. Provide an accurate depiction of the interconnection for this water line through The Vistas to E Aurora Pkwy.



[MUR Page 6]

12P. Provide detail for the location of the two points of paved emergency access, looped water supply and all off-site roadways necessary to provide the two distinct points of access for each phase.

[MUR Page 11]

12Q. A looped water system is required throughout all phases (include in the narrative).

[MUR Page 18]

12R. Question: Are all scenarios proposing a possible connection as this connection is not shown on all drawings?

[MUR Page 41]

12S. Although proposed, this line is not a definitive 2nd connection for Overlook at KPS.

[MUR Page 55]

12T. This water line does not match what is shown in the MUR submitted for the Vistas.

12U. All water infrastructure proposed on this sheet reflect water mains within Kings Point North and Vistas at KPS providing connections to Overlook at KPS. The proposed would provide a looped water system dependent on completion of the surrounding sub-divisions.

12V. This appears to be an extended dead-end water main. How do you intend on meeting the looped water supply requirement? It seems that this portion in blue will be dependent on the future water main connection in The Vistas and Kings Point South Filing No1, which is conceptual in nature.

12W. Add to Notes: Roadways and looped water supply must meet COA minimum requirements.

12X. It seems that this portion in blue will be dependent on the future water main connection in Kings Point North.

### **13. Aurora Water** (Nina Khanzadeh / 720-859-4365 / [rkhanzad@auroragov.org](mailto:rkhanzad@auroragov.org) / Comments in red)

[MUR Page 1]

13A. This document has extensive references to the Sanford property. The Sanford MUS is currently in its 1st review. Due to the nature of this MUS being dependent on the Sanford property for water and sewer, please note that delays may be possible while Aurora Water is coordinating comments in regard to the Sanford MUS. Please continue efforts with Terracina working on the Sanford development to ensure the most up-to-date information is presented in this MUS.

[MUR Page 5]

13B. Provide line delineations to understand property limit relations between this development, Samford (Vistas at King's Point), and KPN and KPS.

13C. Show Vistas at King's Point development.

[MUR Page 6]

13D. Show these areas in an exhibit.

13E. An amendment was completed in January 2023- please reference that.

13F. Discussion needed on Vistas at King's Point.

[MUR Page 7]

13G. Reference the updated 2023 standards as listed on the Aurora Water website.

13H. Flowing full or 1/2 full using Manning's formula and (N=0.011 for PVC or N=0.013 for RCP or VCP).

13I. Show the property limits of these developments.

13J. Show the Vistas at Kings Point.

13K. Add: and Filing 2.

13L. Ensure all offsite basins are also accounted for.

[MUR Page 8]

13M. Would recommend having the quantity of homes description in the introduction with an exhibit also showing where these will be located.

13N. Check this number.

13O. Ensure these points are identified in the exhibit.

[MUR Page 9]

13P. Vistas at King's Point- the exhibits above/below misspell Sanford.

13Q. This property has their 1st review in.

13R. Label: Vistas at King's Point.



- 13S. Have further coordination with Vistas team to ensure accurate projections are shown in the MUS. It appears that the KP South MUS may have not included the Vistas in their MUS.
- 13T. Vistas has over 300 units designated for their development.  
[MUR Page 11]
- 13U. A looped water system is required throughout all phases- include in narrative.  
[MUR Page 12]
- 13V. Show locations of PRVs and check valves in exhibit.
- 13W. Provide a summary of pipe sizes that will be used for water and sanitary. Summarize locations of water and sanitary off site connections.  
[MUR Page 13]
- 13X. MUS was updated in December 2023 and approved by the City.
- 13Y. MUS amendment was approved in January 2023.  
[MUR Page 15]
- 13Z. Please also delineate the property limits of KPN, KPS, and any other development related to this MUS.  
[MUR Page 17]
- 13AA. Please send live calcs for water and sanitary via email.  
[MUR Page 18]
- 13BB. Appears certain nodes are not shown, as listed on the following sheets.
- 13CC. Show and label PRVs and Check Valves.  
[MUR Page 46]
- 13DD. Which design point to correlate to sanitary exhibit? Need circular worksheets for every design point.  
[MUR Page 50]
- 13EE. Reference the up-to-date date Kings Point North amendment-Typical.  
[MUR Page 54]
- 13FF. In your MUS signature set also provide the water and sanitary exhibits separately as a 24 by 36 PDFs.  
[MUR Page 55]
- 13GG. Provide more distinct boundaries line types or coloring.
- 13HH. Remove- changes that deviate from approved MUS are subject to additional reviews and potential MUS amendments.
- 13II. Clarify this as HR Green's MUS only includes an 8-inch and 12-inch stub on their eastern property boundary.
- 13JJ. Is there an expected date as to when this 12" Sanford waterline will be built?
- 13KK. Please also provide additional water or modify the overall exhibit previously included to understand where downstream services are originating from.
- 13LL. Doesn't match what is currently shown in the 1st draft of the Vistas at Kings Point MUS.  
[MUR Page 56]
- 13MM. Fire department does not sign sanitary sewer exhibits.
- 13NN. Clarify this as HR Green's MUS does not address the continuation of the 8-inch Sanford line, as they only provide an 8-inch stub.
- 13OO. Would recommend including an additional sanitary exhibit showing the proposed connections for this development as well as the offsite infrastructure needed to service this site. The exhibit should relate the ECCV line, Long Ave and elementary school as mentioned in the narrative.
- 13PP. Clarify when Samford this planning on putting in this private sanitary line. This is not shown in the MUS for Sanford. Coordinate efforts with them.
- 13QQ. Provide an overall map, hard to understand where this connection point is from KPN.

**14. Forestry (Rebecca Lamphear / 303-739-7177 / [rlamphea@auroragov.org](mailto:rlamphea@auroragov.org) / Comments in purple)**

[Tab 8 Page 2]

- 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](mailto:cbish@auroragov.org) / Comments in mauve)**

15A. Comments from PROS are forthcoming, please reach out to the reviewer directly for comments.

**16. Real Property (Roger Nelson / 720-587-2657 / [ronelson@auroragov.org](mailto: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](mailto: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 3]

17B. Update the cost/acre.

**18. Xcel Energy (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / [donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto:donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com))**

18A. Public Service Company has no objection to this proposed rezone, contingent upon PSCo's ability to maintain all existing rights and this amendment should not hinder our ability for future expansion, including all present and any future accommodations for natural gas transmission and electric transmission related facilities, and that our current use/enjoyment of the area would continue to be an accepted use on the property and that it be "grandfathered" into these changes.

18B. See the attached letter from Xcel Energy for the standard distribution easement requirements.

18C. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas service via [xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect](http://xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect). It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details.

18D. If additional easements need to be acquired by separate PSCo document, a Right-of-Way Agent will need to be contacted.

**19. Mile High Flood District (Laura Hinds / 303-455-6277 / [submittals@mhfd.org](mailto:submittals@mhfd.org))**

19A. We have no comments on the Zoning Map Amendment. We appreciate the opportunity to review this application and look forward to working with you as the drainage design progresses.

**20. Douglas County (Curtis J. Weitkunat / 303-660-7460 / [cweitkunat@douglas.co.us](mailto:cweitkunat@douglas.co.us))**

[Addressing Comments]

20A. Street naming and addressing will be evaluated with final plat. Contact [DCAddressing@douglas.co.us](mailto:DCAddressing@douglas.co.us) or 303.660.7411

[Engineering Comments]

20B. The ROW for the future extension of Pine Drive needs to be provided with the project.

20C. The applicant is responsible for their fair share contribution towards the future Pine Drive Expansion.

[Planning Comments]

20D. Please require non buildable tracts or larger lot sizes to serve as a reasonable transition to the 5+ acre parcels to the south in unincorporated Douglas County



**Right of Way & Permits**

1123 West 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue  
Denver, Colorado 80223  
Telephone: **303.571.3306**  
Facsimile: 303.571.3284  
Donna.L.George@xcelenergy.com

April 25, 2023

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

Attn: Erik Gates

**Re: The Overlook at Kings Point South, Case # DA-1628-08**

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCO) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the master plan and zoning map amendment for **The Overlook at Kings Point South**. Public Service Company has no objection to this proposed rezone, contingent upon PSCO's ability to maintain all existing rights and this amendment should not hinder our ability for future expansion, including all present and any future accommodations for natural gas transmission and electric transmission related facilities, and that our current use/enjoyment of the area would continue to be an accepted use on the property and that it be "grandfathered" into these changes.

For plats, Xcel Energy's standard distribution easement requirements are as follows:

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

The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas service via [xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect](https://xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect). It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details.

If additional easements need to be acquired by separate PSCo document, a Right-of-Way Agent will need to be contacted.

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

# METRO DISTRICTS PUBLIC ART GUIDELINES FOR AURORA, CO

## Notes for Developers

updated 1/17/2023

### ***What Type of Art Projects Are Appropriate?***

Unique or limited edition artworks created by a professional artist

- Functional elements such as gates, benches, fountains, or shade structures;
- Landscape integrated enhancements such as passageways, bridges, street lighting elements, or garden features;
- Mosaics or terrazzo walls, floors, and passageways;
- Sculpture such as freestanding, wall-supported, suspended, kinetic, or electronic;
- Neon, LED, glass, photographs, prints, and any combination of media including sound, film, video, or other interdisciplinary artwork.
- Artwork(s) situated at publically accessible/visible locations.

### ***What Type of Art Projects are NOT Appropriate?***

- Reproductions or unlimited editions of original work;
- Art objects that are mass-produced;
- Artworks that are decorative, ornamental or functional elements of the architecture or landscape design, except when commissioned by a professional artist;
- Architectural rehabilitation or historical preservation;
- Directional elements such as super-graphics, signage, or graphics that would already be a part of the project;
- Fountains or playground equipment that is mass-produced;
- Designs that are created by the project architect or landscape architect firms;
- Business Logos
- Artworks situated at interior locations, offices, or within other spaces that are not accessible to the public.

### ***What Costs are Eligible to be Expensed to the Public Art Budget?***

- Public Art Plan Application Fee paid to the City of Aurora Art in Public Places, (5% of the required public art budget)
- Long-term maintenance of the artwork, up to 10% of the public art budget.
- Project Coordination Fee, up to 10% of the public art budget including artist solicitation costs including call for entries printing and mailing, artist proposal design fee, and other costs.
- Professional artist's budget (75% of the total funding), including:
  - artist fees
  - materials
  - labor costs for assistants
  - insurance
  - permits
  - taxes

- business and legal expenses
- operating costs
- art dealer's fees
- site preparation
- fabrication
- installation
- photography of the work
- ID plaque
- artwork lighting

**Example Project: Total Budget of \$100,000**

75% Professional Artist Budget \$75,000

5% Public Art Plan Application Fee (paid to City) \$ 5,000

10% Future Maintenance & Repairs (set aside) \$ 10,000

10% Project Coordination (up to 10%) \$ 10,000

**Current Rates for Calculating the Public Art Requirement**

Residential = \$381.13 per acre

Mixed Use = \$586.35 per acre

Non-Residential = \$540 per acre

**Who is Responsible for Project Coordination and What Does that Include?**

The Developer may use in-house staff, the landscape architecture firm, the architecture firm, a private consultant, or AIPP Staff to coordinate the public art project. Up to 10% of the public art budget may be used to offset this administration cost. Coordination responsibilities include:

- Meet with Developer and City to define the public art project including potential sites, themes, budget, schedule, professional artist selection process, and Public Art Plan Requirements.
  - Set communication procedures and act as liaison between the selected artist, City of Aurora, Developer, landscape architect, engineers, and architects.
  - Establish Budget Controls.
  - Implement professional artist selection process (see "What is the Artist Selection Process?")
  - Prepare the Public Art Plan for review by the Director of Library and Cultural Services via AIPP Staff.
- Prepare and monitor artist contract.
  - Monitor art fabrication process.
  - Ensure adherence to schedules, public safety issues, permitting, and budget.
  - Assist artist in developing a maintenance and conservation plan and procedures for the artwork.
  - Coordinate site preparation and installation logistics with project architect, landscape architect, and engineers.
  - Supervise installation of artwork.
  - Prepare identification plaque and artwork documentation.

- Prepare the Closing Documents for review by AIPP Staff after the project is completed and documented.

***What is included in the Public Art Plan?***

The Preliminary Public Art Plan is due with the first site plan or contextual site plan for the development. Two copies of the initial plan should be submitted to the AIPP Coordinator for review and approval by the Director of Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services Department. The Preliminary Public Art Plan must include:

- The public art budget including total budget, fee to the city, and itemized expenses as defined earlier.
- Narrative description of the intent including potential sites, themes, materials and the relationship to the overall development project;
- Schedule/timeline

After the artist is selected and the Developer has approved the artwork, the Project Coordinator prepares an addendum to the Public Art Plan and submits it (2 copies) to the AIPP Staff for review by the Director of Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services Department. This addendum should include:

- Narrative description of the proposed artwork including theme, materials, scale
- The artist’s itemized budget;
- Documentation: artist drawings, plans, or other media reflecting the project;
- Artist resume and biography (including contact information);
- Maintenance plan;

***What is the Artist Selection Process?***

The Developer will work with the Project Coordinator and AIPP Staff at the initial meeting to decide which option works best for the project. The Developer and/or its assigns will be responsible for selecting the artwork. There are three processes to choose from:

- Open Competition
  - The Project Coordinator prepares a Request for Qualifications to be advertised.
  - A Panel (selected by the Developer) reviews the submitted professional artist application packets (not proposals), including images of past work, letters of interest, and resumes.
  - The Panel selects finalists to prepare a proposal for the site who are paid a design fee.
  - Finalists present their designs to the Panel and are interviewed.
  - The Panel recommends the most appropriate artists/proposals.
  - The Project Coordinator prepares a Public Art Plan Addendum for review by the City’s Director of Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services.
- Invitational Competition
  - The Panel will review slides by professional artists recommended by the AIPP Staff or Project Coordinator.
  - Professional artists are asked to submit an application packet (not proposals), including slides of past work, letters of interest, and resumes.

- The Panel selects finalists who prepare proposals for the site and are paid a design fee.
- The finalists present proposals to the panel during an interview process.
- The Panel recommends the most appropriate artists/proposals.
- Direct Purchase
  - The AIPP Staff or the Project Coordinator recommends existing artwork for purchase.
  - The Panel selects the artwork to purchase from the recommendations.
  - The Project Coordinator prepares a Public Art Plan for review by the City's Director of Library, Recreation, and Cultural Services.

***Who Qualifies as a Professional Artist?***

The criteria below are based on art industry standards of who qualifies as a professional artist. Artists who are being considered for a public art project(s) under this program must meet one or more of the criteria.

- Bachelor of Fine Art and/or Master of Fine Art from an accredited college or university;
- Exhibition experience in a professional context, i.e., galleries, museum, art centers, or other exhibit venues;
- Is recognized by his/her peers as such by way of honorable mentions, awards, prizes, scholarships, appointments, and/or grants;
- Is pursuing his/her work as a means of livelihood and/or a way to achieve the highest level of professional recognition;
- Has had his/her artwork publicly written about or discussed;
- Has his/her artwork held in public or private collections;
- Is commissioned or employed on the basis of his/her art skills.

***Special Circumstance***

If the public art plan calls for locating the art within a park that will be turned over to the city of Aurora after it is created, and therefore the art would be turned over to the COA as well, the art selection process will be managed by COA, and all funds for project coordination, maintenance, etc. will be retained by the City of Aurora.

***Public Art Staff Contact Information***

Roberta Bloom, Public Art Coordinator

[rbloom@auroragov.org](mailto:rbloom@auroragov.org)

303 739-6747

**Project Name:** Overlook at King's Point South

**Project Number:** 1695705 DA-1628-08 / RE2023-062

**Date Received:** 04/13/2023

**Jurisdiction:** City of Aurora

**Due Date:** 04/28/2023

**Addressing Comments:**

Street naming and addressing will be evaluated with final plat. Contact [DCAddressing@douglas.co.us](mailto:DCAddressing@douglas.co.us) or 303.660.7411.

**Engineering Comments:**

- 1.) The ROW for the future extension of Pine Drive needs to be provided with the project.
- 2.) The applicant is responsible for their fair share contribution towards the future Pine Drive Expansion.

**Planner Comments:**

Please require non buildable tracts or larger lot sizes to serve as a reasonable transition to the 5+ acre parcels to the south in unincorporated Douglas County.