

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



December 31, 2020

Thomas Gissen
Meritage Homes
8400 Crescent Pkwy, Ste 200
Greenwood Village, CO 80111

Re: Second Submission Review – Murphy Creek PA 16 & 20 – Site Plan w/ Adjustments, Plat
Application Number: **DA-1250-48**
Case Numbers: **2020-4020-00**

Dear Mr. Gissen:

Thank you for your initial submission, which we started to process on Wednesday, December 9, 2020. 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 a technical submission after the Planning Commission hearing set for January 13, 2021. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before Monday, January 18, 2021.

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.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please let me know. I may be reached at (303) 739-7184 or hlamboy@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Heather Lamboy, Planning Supervisor
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Karen Henry, Henry Design Group
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\1250-48rev2



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Please address the technical comments below.
- License agreements are needed; please remember that a license agreement takes approximately 6-8 weeks to process and must be complete prior to recordation of Site Plan mylars.
- Please provide more detailed elevations and the Murphy Creek Design Review Board approval letter.
- Please provide a material/sample exhibit.
- Traffic comments will be sent under separate cover.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. No comments were received from the public.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

- 2A. *Repeat comment:* No adjacent property owner information was uploaded to the case file. Please upload this information so we can refer the case out for their review.
- 2B. *Repeat comment:* Please get an updated list of neighborhood associations and request that Scott Campbell upload these into the AMANDA system for referral purposes.
- 2C. Murphy Creek Design Review approval letter must be received prior to final approval. As part of the Planning Commission report, a condition of approval will be recommended that addresses this issue.
- 2D. *Repeat comment:* Please provide a material/sample exhibit.

3. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

- 3A. Please remember that there are very specific standards related to architecture for Single Family Detached residential homes. Please refer to Section 2.2.1 of the Murphy Creek Development Standards. Included are minimum floor area, porch design, masonry requirements, roof shapes/materials, and more. Please provide more detailed house models and elevations. You will likely need that for the Murphy Creek DRB. They can be provided with the Murphy Creek DRB approval letter.

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

Sheet L-1 Landscape Plan

- 4A. If these are to remain on the landscape plan, add them to the legend a block numbers.
- 4B. These two hatches are tough to decipher from one another on the plan, plus it makes seeing the shrubs in the beds more difficult. If possible, just handle the rock mulches as a note on the plan and remove the hatching all together. 1.5" in to be used in "X" areas and 2"-4" cobble in "Y" areas.
- 4C. No matchline information along here.

Sheet L-2 Landscape Plan

- 4D. Add these two hatches to the legend.
- 4E. Some plant call-outs are missing. Make sure these plants are 26" or less in height from the roadway surface within the sight distance triangles.

Sheet L-4 Landscape Plan

- 4F. No matchline information.
- 4G. The residential yard requirements should be shown. Do not recite the code as the inspectors only inspect to what is proposed for actual front yard landscaping. They can't figure out in the field what the front yard lot size is and determine what should have been included. Refer to the examples e-mailed under separate cover.
- 4H. A few plants have been flagged as being potentially too tall within the sight distance triangles.

Sheet L-5 Landscape Plan

- 4I. Is there no fencing being provided between the rear lots?

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



- 5A. *Repeat comment:* 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.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

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

- 6A. The Site Plan will not be approved until the Preliminary Drainage Report/Letter is approved by Public Works.
- 6B. Please remove AutoCad SHX text items in the comment section. Please flatten to reduce the select-ability of the items.
- 6C. This needs to be a single filing or two separate drainage reports are required. *[Comment from Heather: This should be fixed with the renaming of the plans as redlined]*
- 6D. When will a subdivision plat be submitted?
- 6E. There will not be crosswalks provided across Jewell until a traffic signal is installed.
- 6F. A license agreement is required for the island and is required to be recorded prior to the approval of the site plan.
- 6G. Per previous comment, dimension the length of the transition, typical. (Sheets 4 & 5)
- 6H. Show and label proposed retaining walls. Indicate material type and max height or height range.
- 6I. On the detention pond, label the slope, not the max slope (Sheets 6 & 7)
- 6J. Label the slope in the pond bottom, don't just add a 2% min. note. (Sheets 6 & 7)
- 6K. The pond is private and will be privately maintained. (Sheets 6 & 7)
- 6L. Include the FIRM Panel and effective date (Sheet 7).
- 6M. This is not a typical street profile. A steeper slope should be provided across the "eyebrow" to ensure positive drainage (Sheet 7).
- 6N. For all non-paved areas, 2% slope.

7. Traffic Engineering (Carlie Campuzano / 303-739-7309 / ccampuza@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

Traffic Letter

- 7A. No comments were received as of the date of this letter and will be sent under separate cover.

Site Plan

- 7B. No comments were received as of the date of this letter and will be sent under separate cover.

8. Fire / Life Safety (John VanEssen / 303-739-7489 / jvanesse@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Sheet 3

- 8A. Please relabel the Gating Detail "Fire Lane" Gate Detail.

Sheet 5

- 8B. Please add the Sidewalks and Curb and Gutter into the 6" PCC standards to meet the imposed weight of 85K (along the entire Fire Lane) for the Fire Apparatuses.

Sheet 8 & 9

- 8C. Please label the 23' Manual Swinging Gate with Knox Lock on Utility Plans.
- 8D. Please label the 23' Fire Lane Easement on Utility Plans.

9. Aurora Water (Daniel Pershing / 303-739-7646 / ddpershi@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

Sheet 8

- 9A. This portion of the waterline is not covered by easement or ROW dedication. I suggest dedicate separate easements. One 23' easement for firelane and one 16' easement for the utility.

Sheet 9

- 9B. Please revise text issues, typ.
- 9C. This portion of waterline is not covered by the 23' easement as it is outside of the proposed fire lane and



utility easement dedication.

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

- 10A. Call out the shortest distance from edge of path to retaining wall. PROS needs to retain at least a 5' setback from the edge of the wall to the edge of the path.
- 10B. Note the outlet structure will need to be covered by the license agreement.
- 10C. In previous discussions, we noted that the flows above 5 years will be directed to existing swales on the golf course property to ensure direction into the creek. Please identify those for context.

Real Property (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / mbrooks@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

Cover Sheet

- 10D. Change text type, some information is lost throughout the Site Plan.

Sheet 2

- 10E. Change text type, some information is lost throughout the Site Plan.

Sheet 3

- 10F. Change text type, some information is lost throughout the Site Plan.

- 10G. A license agreement is needed for the gates in the right-of-way.

Sheet 4

- 10H. Change text type, some information is lost throughout the Site Plan.

- 10I. Add the bearings, distances and curve data to all the Lots, Tracts and R.O.W. to match the plat information.

- 10J. A license agreement is needed for the gates in the right-of-way.

Sheet 5

- 10K. Change text type, some information is lost throughout the Site Plan.

- 10L. Add the bearings, distances and curve data to all the Lots, Tracts and R.O.W. to match the plat information.

- 10M. A license agreement is needed for the gates in the right-of-way.

11. Mile High Flood District (Mark Schutte / 303-455-6277 / submittals@udfcd.org)

- 11A. Please see attached letter. MHFD has no comments related to the improvements as proposed in the Site Plan. Additional comments are outlined in the review letter related to the drainage report.

MAINTENANCE ELIGIBILITY PROGRAM (MEP)

MHFD Referral Review Comments

| For Internal MHFD Use Only. | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| MEP ID: | 108302 |
| Submittal ID: | 10005519/10005520 |
| MEP Phase: | Referral |

Date: December 11, 2020

To: George Slovensky and Heather Lamboy
Via email

RE: MHFD Referral Review Comments

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Project Name: | Murphy Creek PA 16 and 20 (RSNs 1489380 and 1485115) |
| Location: | East of Old Tom Morris Rd and Jewell Ave Intersection |
| Drainageway: | Murphy Creek |

This letter is in response to the request for our comments concerning the referenced project. We have reviewed this proposal only as it relates to maintenance eligibility of major drainage features, in this case:

- Basin B WQ Pond Spillway and Pipe Outfall (south of Jewell Avenue)

We have the following comments to offer:

- 1) We have no comments related to the improvements as proposed in this preliminary drainage report and plat. The following comments are items for consideration for the final drainage report phase.
- 2) For the outfall north of Jewell Ave (which is not maintenance eligible because it ties into an existing outfall – this is fine with us): please ensure that if the proposed condition will increase flows to the existing storm sewer and outfall, that the outfall still has adequate protection.
- 3) For future submittals (final drainage report and CDs), please provide the following information to help us understand the protection provided for the Maintenance Eligible outfall south of Jewell:
 - a. Plan and profile views of both the outfall and spillway showing the connection from the pond to the invert of the main channel of Murphy Creek.
 - b. Details for the spillway and outfall showing size, material, and dimensions of protection.
 - c. Supporting calculations for the protection provided (or adequacy of the existing protection) in the final drainage report.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,



Mark Schutte, P.E., CFM
Project Engineer, Sand Creek
Mile High Flood District

