



2953 South Peoria Street, Suite 101
Aurora, Colorado 80014
303.770.7201 fax 303.770.7132

June 14, 2021

Heather L. Lamboy, AICP
Planning Department, City of Aurora
15151 E. Alameda Parkway
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: Kings Point South / Initial Submittal Review – Comment Responses

Dear Mr. Johnson:

This letter is in response to the City of Aurora's comments received following our Pre-Application meeting. Please see the responses following the comments in *red italics*.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS:

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns:

- a. No community comments were received.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application:

- a. Development Review fees are due prior to the second submission. Your second submission will not be accepted until the \$29,998 fee is paid.
Response: Noted.
- b. Please include a plat with the second submission. Since there are a large number of comments, it is likely the currently proposed lot layout and design will have to be changed.
Response: A plat will be submitted as part of this submission.
- c. Comments from Mile High Flood District (MHFD) are forthcoming. The recently updated standards that call for more natural drainageways may have an impact on the site design.
Response: MHFD provided comments for the project.
- d. Please complete the Site Plan Details lot matrix with the next submission.
Response: Noted – lot matrix information added.
- e. A photometric plan is not required.
Response: Noted – photometric plan removed from plan set.
- f. Elevation drawings which illustrate the different home models must be included with the next submission. Please provide a materials/sample exhibit with the next submission. Elevations must meet the UDO design standards for single-family detached development.
Response: Noted – will provide elevation drawings.
- g. In addition to sheet descriptions, please include "Sheet X of Y".
Response: Added to title block.
- h. Please refer to the Site Plan Manual for required Site Plan notes. Many notes are not included or are out of date.
Response: Site plan notes have been added and updated.
- i. Please provide a table on Sheet 2 that lists the planning areas, and the number and type of lots per area.

Response: Table of Planning Areas has been added with requested information.

3. General Landscape Plan Comments:

- a. It is suggested that you review the King's Point South FDP for compliance with design standards including standards related to construction on slopes. A topographic tool kit, which requires homes to be constructed in a manner that minimizes the use of retaining walls, applies. The site plan must be redesigned to eliminate retaining walls and meet the urban design standards of the toolkit.

Response: Noted.

- b. Remove "Not for Construction" on all plans with the exception of the landscape plans.

Response: Noted – "Not for Construction" removed with exception of landscape plans.

- c. In addition to the topography toolkit, subdivision standards in the Unified Development Ordinance will be applicable to this development. Section 146-4.3.5.B requires that grading on or near ridgelines and swales shall maintain the approx. topographic form. Significant reconstruction of prominent topographic features shall be avoided.

Response: Per discussions with COA, PROS, and appropriate stakeholders, ridgeline will be regraded to allow for multi-purpose turf area with reasonably level slope to the maximum extent possible.

- d. Section 146-4.3.17.A requires that parks and open space shall be located on prominent high points with significant views. The proposed park and open space at the heart of the development take advantage of the views of the Front Range and meets this criterion.

Response: Noted.

- e. The Public Improvements Plan calls out required improvements for Phase 1 neighborhood. In this particular case, King's Point South is required to provide a right-in, right-out connection to East Aurora Parkway when it is constructed.

Response: Right-in, right-out connection to Aurora Parkway provided.

4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues:

- a. In Subarea C, the maximum block length and width shall be 700 feet, and the perimeter of the blocks may not exceed 2,800 linear feet. There are topographic challenges with this site that prevent the execution of this standard in some places, such as the loop that goes around the ridge. An adjustment to Section 146-4.3.9 will need to be requested.

Response: Noted.

- b. Please update the Introduction Letter to include the adjustment request and corresponding justification.

Response: Noted – Letter of Introduction has been updated to include the adjustment request, as well as the corresponding justification.

5. Architectural and Urban Design Issues:

- a. The proposed park as designed does not have sufficient access to the street. It is possible and likely that some residents will drive to access the park amenities and so park visitors will likely park along the street to access the amenity.

Response: Noted. Several lots have been removed to increase access. Points of connection and sidewalks have been widened, and curb cuts and mid-block crossings are now shown.

- b. The park, as designed, will be surrounded by the backs of homes. This can become a security issue as there is less activity at the rear of homes and "eyes on the park."

Reduce the number of homes that back to the park to create stronger connections with the street. It is suggested that Block 7 Lots 11-14, Block 7 Lots 41-45, Block 7 Lots 36-37, and Block 7 Lots 19-20 are eliminated to achieve a stronger connection with the street.

***Response:** Noted - several lots have been removed to increase access and visibility.*

- c. This area is considered a “Recreational Neighborhood” for the purposes of the Master Plan. Four distinct architectural styles are expected in this area, which include American Vernacular, Mediterranean, Shingle and Prairie Styles. Please refer to the King’s Point South Master Plan for additional detail. For each lot type and size, there are a minimum number of architectural features required.

***Response:** Noted.*

- d. Each architectural style illustrates a number of options for smaller, thinner homes that will be used on small lots as well as homes more suited for standard or large lots.

***Response:** Noted.*

- e. The Site Plan does not call out the required split-rail fences that abut open space.

***Response:** Site plan updated to refer to split-rail fences.*

- f. Please note there are special lighting standards that apply to this development.

***Response:** Noted.*

- g. A primary entry monument must be provided at the Aurora Parkway entrance. Master Plan standards call for a landscaped median at the entrance. Since the connection is the obligation of King’s Point South, the provided graphic should provide design guidance.

***Response:** Landscaping in median has been provided. Primary entry monument location and design is being coordinated and will be provided in future submittal.*

- h. Will a lift station be required? If so, please illustrate location and provide elevation drawings. A lift station adjacent to the southern pond is illustrated in the Master Plan.

***Response:** We are working with the Cottonwood Water and Sanitation District to outfall to their system which allows for a gravity outfall without a lift station. At this time, no lift station is proposed.*

6. Signage Issues:

- a. Please label the location for neighborhood monument signs and provide a detail to illustrate conformance to master plan standards.

***Response:** Location of neighborhood monument signs is being coordinated and will be provided as part of a future submittal.*

7. Landscaping Issues

- a. Please consider making these trail connections handicap accessible crossings with ramps to accommodate wheelchairs, strollers, etc.

***Response:** Ramps, trail connections and mid-block crossings added to enhance connectivity.*

- b. Add street names, all sheet numbers, and north arrow to Key Map.

***Response:** Requested information added.*

- c. Label contour elevations.

***Response:** Contour elevation labels added.*

- d. Add more shrubs, perennials, and/or ornamental grasses at the entrances to comply with the Site Entryway requirement to include distinctive landscaping consisting of specimen quality plants that provide visual interest during all seasons.

***Response:** Additional and more diverse landscape plantings added near site entryways.*



- e. Please make all stop sign symbols bolder on the plan.
Response: Stop sign symbols boldened.
- f. Street trees can be placed within the sight triangles if they are 50' away from stop signs. Please update all street tree placements to maximize the available curbside landscape areas.
Response: Street trees added within sight triangles while respecting 50' offset from stop signs.
- g. Please consider adding shade trees near benches throughout the site plan.
Response: Noted – shade trees and landscaping added near seating throughout.
- h. Add evergreen trees to legend.
Response: Updated.
- i. Label E-470 on all sheets.
Response: Noted.
- j. Dimension and label MUE on all sheets.
Response: Dimensions and labels added throughout sheets where applicable.
- k. Please consider adding evergreen trees to the block of landscaping behind the lots highlighted, or at least provide a more even distribution of the required 50% evergreen trees behind all lots abutting a collector street.
Response: Noted.
- l. Add more shrubs, perennials, and/or ornamental grasses at the entrances to comply with the Site Entryway requirement to include distinctive landscaping consisting of specimen quality plants that provide visual interest during all seasons.
Response: Additional and more diverse landscape plantings added near site entryways.
- m. Add footnote to all Tree Provided counts where applicable in the legend for reference.
Response: Footnote added.
- n. Please modify footnote text as shown.
Response: Footnote text modified.

8. Addressing

- a. 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 is provided in a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please eliminate any linework outside of the target area.
Response: Project CAD will be provided directly to addressing department.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES:

9. Civil Engineering:

- a. The Site Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the Preliminary Drainage Report is approved.
Response: Noted.
- b. An update to the Master Plan and PUP has not been submitted. Per the existing PIP, Aurora Parkway improvements are required with this development.
Response: It is currently planned that the Aurora Parkway improvements will be completed by the Kings Point (north) development.
- c. In addition to the missing notes, please add the following notes:
 - i. In locations where utility easements overlap drainage easements, only

subsurface utilities shall be permitted within the portion of the utility easement that overlaps the drainage easement. Installation of above ground utilities within a drainage easement requires prior written approval by the City Engineer.

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

Response: Notes have been added.

- d. There are missing standard notes. Please review with Planning.

Response: Missing notes have been added.

- e. What is PIP surfacing?

Response: Acronym clarified in legend.

- f. For alleys that serve more than 10 unites, please provide curb returns rather than a curb cut to meet Section 4.02.4 of the Roadway Manual, typ.

Response: Curb returns are shown for certain alleys.

- g. No streetlights shown.

Response: Streetlights added to plans.

- h. Cross pans are not permitted on streets where storm sewer is nearby.

Response: Cross pans removed where noted.

- i. It would be helpful to have a sheet that shows the overall site.

Response: Overall site plan sheet added to front of plan set.

- j. Show/label streetlights. Add a note that streetlight locations are conceptual. Final streetlight locations will be determined with photometric plans submitted with the street lighting plan in the civil plan submittal. Streetlights also required on King Point Way if not already provided.

Response: Street lights labeled and added throughout plan set. Note added.

- k. Please move the typical sections to the front part of the plan set.

Response: Typical sections relocated in plan set.

- l. Without a subdivision plat submitted, please provide all street centerline information to verify conformance with COA standards.

Response: Plat document submitted concurrently with 2nd submittal

- m. Dimension sidewalks.

Response: Dimensions added.

- n. Label cross pans.

Response: Cross pans labeled.

- o. Dimension sidewalks.

Response: Dimensions added.

- p. Indicate wall material.

-
- Response: Wall material indicated.**
- q. 4' maximum retaining wall height for residential development. Tier walls to provide needed height. All walls greater than 30" require railing. Structural calculations are required with the first civil plan submittal for all walls 4' and higher or tiered walls to provide global stability analysis.
- Response: Retaining wall heights modified – now proposing a max 4' ht.**
- r. Dimension sidewalks.
- Response: Dimensions added.**
- s. Show/label drainage easement, show/label maintenance access to pond bottom and top of the outlet structure, show/label access easement from drainage easement to ROW.
- Response: Labels have been added.**
- t. Label street slopes and slopes in tracts. Min. 2% slope for all non-paved areas. Typ. all grading sheets.
- Response: The requested slopes are labeled.**
- u. See previous comments regarding wall heights.
- Response: Comment noted.**
- v. Show/label drainage easement, show/label maintenance access to pond bottom and top of outlet structure, show/label access easement from drainage easement to ROW, show/label 100-yr water surface elevation, indicate direction of emergency overflow, min. 2% slope in pond bottom, max. 4:1 side slopes.
- Response: Labels have been added.**
- w. Add a note indicating if the storm water system is public or private and who will maintain it.
- Response: A note has been added to the plans.**
- x. Add a note indicating if the storm water system is public or private and who will maintain it.
- Response: A note has been added to the plans.**
- y. Is this supposed to be the 100-year water surface elevation?
- Response: 100-yrWSE has been labeled on the grading sheets. Note clarified to indicate 100-yr water surface elevation.**
- z. Show/label maintenance access, emergency spillway, etc.
- Response: Labels added.**
- aa. Mountable curb is the standard, not the exception.
- Response: The mountable curb is used for all front-loaded product areas.**
- bb. Per the Roadway Manual, mountable curb and gutter is required for all Type 1 and Type 2 streets. There is no indication on the plans where the vertical curb is being proposed.
- Response: Vertical curb is being proposed for all alley loaded streets. Vertical curb areas have been defined and shown on the plans.**
- cc. Please move the typical sections to the front part of the plan set.
- Response: Noted. Typical sections have been moved to front of plan set.**
- dd. A photometric plan is not required with a site plan submittal for single family residential development. Streetlight locations need to be shown on the site plan. A note shall be added to indicate that the streetlight locations shown on the site plan are conceptual. Final streetlight locations will be determined with photometric plan submitted with the street lighting plan in the civil plan submittal.
- Response: Noted – photometric plan sheet has been removed from plan set. Streetlight**

locations are still shown throughout, note and fixture type have been added.

10. Traffic Engineering:

- a. Modification of adjacent site plan will be required for access connection to Aurora Pkwy.
Response: Noted.
- b. All ramps need a receiving ramp. In some locations, removal of crossings is an appropriate action.
Response: Noted – ramps updated/removed as necessary.
- c. All-way stop intersections will only be approved if they meet warrants. This should be shown in the TIS.
Response: Noted.
- d. "STOP SIGN (TYP)" callout is not adequate. Label all access and internal intersections signs individually. Some signs are covered up by other callouts. Consider implementing keyed notes to save space.
Response: Noted – access and internal intersection signs have been labeled individually with keyed notes.
- e. Show access movements.
Response: Noted – will show access movements.
- f. Provide crosswalk striping here.
Response: Noted – will provide crosswalk striping.
- g. Remove east-west crossing ramps.
Response: Removed.
- h. Consider adding enhanced pedestrian crossing along Street G. Also consider a road narrowing at this crossing.
Response: Noted.
- i. All ramps need a receiving ramp. In some locations, removal of crossings is an appropriate action.
Response: Noted – ramps updated/removed as necessary.
- j. Proposed ramps need receiving ramps installed as well.
Response: Noted – ramps updated.
- k. Show Sight Triangles per COA STD TE-13 at all site accesses and internal intersections. Provide dimensions. The sight triangles must be drawn in respect to where the stop signs are located, (TYP).
Response: Sight triangles have been added to sheets throughout plan set.
- l. See City of Aurora TIS Guidelines, page 6, for list of required figures to be included in the body of the TIS.
Response: Noted.
- m. Aurora Parkway is projected to be built in the 2020's by an adjacent development. It will connect to Parker Rd (SH 83) at initial build. This need to be incorporated into the study. Add the site access along Aurora Parkway and the Roundabout to the list of study intersections.
Response: Acknowledged and included.
- n. Each internal intersection that proposed to be an all-way stop needs to be studied and meet warrants.
Response: No AWSC.
- o. Provide CDOT Access coded auxiliary lane warrant analysis.
Response: Included.

-
- p. Provide a diagram of existing and proposed laneage for each study intersection.
Response: *Included in Synchro graphics.*
- q. Provide existing, 2025 Background, and 2040 background analysis at the intersection of Cottonwood Dr and Kings Point Pl.
Response: *Included.*
- r. Provide discussion on proposed internal streets. Include, classifications, design speeds, etc.
Response: *Included.*
- s. Provide internal site circulation plan that shows proposed intersection control.
Response: *Project too small for internal circulation analysis.*
- t. Provide discussion section for pedestrian safety and internal circulation. Provide enhancement recommendations, or comment on the omission, of enhanced crossings at uncontrolled legs of intersection. There are currently two uncontrolled crossings show on the site plan at each Kings Point Way access.
Response: *Included.*
- u. Please make grammatical corrections throughout.
Response: *None noted.*
- v. This page could be construed as a transmittal letter exclusive of the report. Add a cover sheet to formally encapsulate and/or provide an engineer's certification statement and stamp within the report itself.
Response: *It is a combined cover and transmittal letter.*
- w. Provide Table of Contents with page numbers. Ensure that all sections, subsections, figures, and appendices listed in the City's TIS Guidelines are included in this report.
Response: *Study text is only 7 pages. No formal TOC is necessary.*
- x. Number sections as shown in the TIS guidelines.
Response: *Study text is only 7 pages. Numbering is not necessary.*
- y. Provide project description, project size (area), land-use, anticipated build-out year, future study year. See TIS guidelines for additional required info.
Response: *Included.*
- z. Provide current site plan in the appendix.
Response: *Formal Site Plan submitted under separate cover.*
- aa. This site is at city limits. Please provide discussion on jurisdictional boundaries and show on vicinity map.
Response: *Can be seen on City maps.*
- bb. There exists an IGA between Aurora and Parker that governs Kings Point Way. Please mention this.
Response: *Included.*
- cc. Provide location description (direction, and distance) of the terminus from the project site.
Response: *Can be seen on Site Plan under separate cover.*
- dd. Aurora Pkwy will be built by an adjacent development (Kings Point FLG #1, Civil Plans approved in 2020). Kings Point South will need connection to Aurora Pkwy at the Roundabout for full build-out. Please include in this study.
Response: *Included.*
- ee. Break into individual paragraphs for each access.
Response: *Included.*
- ff. Note access spacing and location. Identify "North" and "South" accesses as shown in the

appendix.

Response: Included.

- gg. Provide figures for trip distribution percentages, and site generated traffic movements at each study intersection. Provide discussion on how the distribution was determined.

Response: Included.

- hh. Break section out into "Background Traffic" and "Future Total Traffic." For Background Traffic, are there any adjacent studies that need to be incorporated? This will be critical for the Cottonwood @ Kings Point intersection. Provide any adjacent study Trip Generations in the appendix. Include Kings Point MTIS. Additionally, coordinate with the Town of Parker to obtain adjacent TISs to be included in background traffic.

Response: Included.

- ii. Appendices show 2025 not 2022.

Response: Corrected.

- jj. LOS E and worse, at unsignalized intersections, is only permitted by the City on minor street movements that have an alternate route. Revise this section to indicate the City's specific LOS requirements. Consider adding a table showing HCM's delay time range for each LOS.

Response: No LOS F shown.

- kk. Provide queuing summary figure. Show all turn lanes at each study intersection. Show calculated queue, and recommended storage.

Response: Included.

- ll. Include the construction of Kings Point Way, and its classification. Include auxiliary turn lanes along Kings Point Way in this section. Consider providing a summary table.

Response: Included.

- mm. Identify areas where traffic calming may be necessary/suitable. Notably, internal Street "C" is uncontrolled for a significant length and contains house frontage and pedestrian crossing.

Response: Discussed.

- nn. Break appendix into multiple sections.

Response: Sections not necessary – graphics and report are identified by year and peak hour.

- oo. These diagrams can stay in the appendix. However, please include these, or something similar, within the body of the report in the Existing Conditions, Site Generated Traffic and Distribution, Background Traffic, and Total Traffic sections.

Response: Not necessary – study too small to double up on graphics.

11. Fire/Life Safety

- a. If no fire lands are on site, remove note 5 and 9.

Response: Notes have been removed.

- b. COA has adopted the 2015 IBC Code set. Please update note.

Response: Note has been updated.

- c. If no gate or barrier systems are installed on site please remove note 1.

Response: Note has been removed.

- d. See note regarding fire hydrant orientation.

Response: Note.

- e. Are there any barricades or gating at this dead end?

Response: Connection to Aurora Parkway is now being proposed – no gating or

- barricades are being proposed.*
- f. Remove this hydrant.
Response: Hydrant has been removed.
- g. Relocate this hydrant to this location.
Response: Hydrant has been relocated
- h. Change handicap to accessible, typ. all sheets.
Response: Callout has been updated throughout plan set.
- i. Verify with parks to determine if ramps will be required where the path crosses the roadway, typ.
Response: Paths have been updated to include ADA ramps at mid-block crossings.
- j. If mail kiosks are going to be used on site provide location and Kiosk detail, typ. All Sheets. If mail Kiosks are being used show accessible curb ramps to provide access.
Response: Mail kiosks are being coordinated and will be provided in a future submittal.
- k. Work with the COA Water Department to establish a looped water supply or evaluate if water line will supply a sufficient water supply to this site approved by COA water department.
Response: Our understanding is that Kings Point North is moving forward, therefore we will have a looped water supply to the site.
- l. Please show all hydrants within 1000' of this site to include the nearest existing hydrant.
Response: Existing/future King Point North hydrants are shown on the plan.
- m. At this time this is a dead end and Aurora Parkway is not being constructed. Show Second point of access to the site. 2nd point of access is required once construction begins or the 31st home. Provide a Phasing plan to include the construction of E Aurora Parkway or other compliant second point of access.
Response: Second access to the site is now being proposed. Our understanding is that Kings Point North is moving forward, therefore Aurora Parkway will be constructed and available as a second access for our project site.
- n. If this site is going to be built in phases, please provide a phasing plan.
Response: Phases not currently anticipated for the site
- o. Please provide an overall site plan.
Response: Overall site plan has been added to plan set.
- p. Add hydrant to this location.
Response: Added.
- q. Work with Real Property to determine Public Access easements for Drive A and Drive B.
Response: Comment noted.
- r. Please relocate this hydrant to this location.
Response: Relocated.
- s. Remove this hydrant.
Response: Removed.
- t. Relocate this hydrant to this location.
Response: Relocated.
- u. Verify location of existing hydrant and show locations of existing hydrants within 1000' of site.
Response: Existing/future Kings Point North hydrants are shown on the plan.
- v. Include new locations of hydrant on landscape sheets. Note hydrants shall remain unobstructed and have a minimum 5' clearance around the hydrant.
Response: Updated hydrant locations have been added throughout plan set.

12. Aurora Water:

- a. Need to show drainage utility easements.
Response: Easements are shown on the plans.
- b. Include the definition of this symbol on all applicable sheets.
Response: A legend has been added to all the sheets.
- c. Is this storm drain a COA asset? Aurora Water has no record of this.
Response: Our understanding from the Town of Parker plans is that this is a public COA storm sewer.
- d. Storm drain should remain private.
Response: This is an existing public storm sewer, we have continued to show it as public.
- e. Should be 6 ft. MH per Aurora Water Spec (typ. when applicable).
Response: MH sizes will be evaluated and changed as needed for final pipe sizes.
- f. Entire pond requires drainage easement.
Response: The pond is located within a drainage easement.
- g. Label as public and provide utility easement.
Response: Labels or an overall note has been added to the plans.
- h. Need maintenance access to outlet structure of pond.
Response: The access path is located adjacent to the outfall structure.
- i. Need maintenance access within 5 ft. of all SS manholes.
Response: Comment noted. This will be coordinated with Cottonwood Drive.
- j. Tract H to be a drainage easement.
Response: It has been called out as such.
- k. Manholes need to be located in utility easement if not located within public ROW.
Response: There is an easement for the MHs now.
- l. License agreement required when private pipe is located in ROW.
Response: This pipe is not private.
- m. Is there a concern with having a UE over a walkway?
Response: No, this is fairly common to have.
- n. These manholes require a maintenance path at a 6% slope and a 3-point turnaround. Currently these manholes are unmaintainable as shown.
Response: This area has been revised to allow for maintenance.
- o. Show utility easement (26 ft. width).
Response: Easement has been shown.
- p. Is a wall proposed here?
Response: No, this area has been regraded.
- q. Needing blow-offs?
Response: No blow`-offs are currently proposed.
- r. Needing water meters and pits (with utility easements) for all homes? Needing a keynote indicating that the portion after the meter is the homeowner's responsibility?
Response: The water meters are all located within the ROW, no easements are necessary.
- s. Phasing and division of neighborhood?
Response: No current phasing is proposed.
- t. Sanitary sewer cleanouts?
Response: Only the services would require cleanouts and we do not show that level of detail.



- u. Sampling stations?
Response: As requested, we have provided one.
- v. Irrigation design plans?
Response: Irrigation design has not been done at this time.
- w. Add sampling station 5 ft. south of fire hydrant.
Response: As requested, we have provided one.
- x. Accommodate this alignment with (2) 45 deg. Bends. Provide slope. Provide utility easement.
Response: This hasn't been changed because it's under a street connection to Aurora Parkway.
- y. Not existing.
Response: This work will be done with Kings Point North, which is moving forward now. It is anticipated that this will be existing before this project develops.
- z. Need to show water meters and pocket utility easements.
Response: Water meters are within ROW.
- aa. Show all utility easements.
Response: Utility easements are shown.
- bb. Remove trees from utility easements.
Response: Trees removed from utility easements.
- cc. Remove trees from utility easements.
Response: Trees removed from utility easements.

13. Forestry:

- a. No comments.

14. PROS:

- a. Refer to redline comments (shown in purple) on sheets of the plan set.
Response: Noted.
- b. Add the following PROS note regarding how park and open space land as well as the improvements upon such land must be open for use by the general public: "Parks, recreation improvements, trails, and open space areas provided to satisfy land dedication requirements in accordance with approved development plans or provided by a metropolitan district or other appropriate jurisdiction or owners association in accordance with approved metropolitan district service plans shall be open to the general public."
Response: Note added.
- c. Coordinate with PROS to ensure the High Plains Trail Extension matches the latest design plans. Associated grading should be shown.
Response: Associated grading has been added.
- d. All internal park paths must be ADA compliant.
Response: Park paths revised to be ADA compliant.
- e. A picnic shelter with tables is a required programmatic element within the park.
Response: Picnic shelter with tables has been added to park.
- f. To comply with PROS' policy for inclusive access, what playground feature is intended to provide meaningful opportunities for children of different abilities to interact, play and learn together? A specialized piece of play equipment should be provided which goes beyond basic ADA accessibility.

***Response:** Inclusive play elements and components have been added to playgrounds for children of different abilities.*

- g. Straighten the meander so that the trail is farther from property lines/fences. A 10' setback would be ideal. The topography in this access corridor looks to be challenging not to exceed 5% longitudinal grade.

***Response:** 10' setback shown where feasible – grading of trails has been updated to meet ADA requirements.*

- h. The facilities/furnishings/features in the park should be specified on a detail sheet as part of the overall plan set.

***Response:** Facilities/furnishings/features moved to its own detail sheet.*

- i. The open space through which the regional trail passes had in the past been intended to be dedicated to the city for ownership and maintenance. The landscape in this area will need to be simplified for city ownership.

***Response:** Landscape has been simplified for city ownership.*

- j. Proposed grading should relate to the High Plains Trail Extension plans. All future contour lines should be shown and tie together.

***Response:** Contour lines added.*

- k. Can a curb cut be provided at this location to facilitate bicycle access from the street to the regional trail?

***Response:** Curb cut added.*

- l. Are these tracts intended to receive open space land dedication credit? The trail should be ADA compliant. Can curb cuts be provided at the street crossings to facilitate pedestrian and bicycle connectivity?

***Response:** Curb cuts incorporated, and paths have been revised to be ADA compliant. Tracts are intended to receive open space.*

- m. Is the plant material in the MUE provided to satisfy the 25' special landscape buffer requirement because of E-470?

***Response:** Correct – refer to Sheet L-10 for E-470 landscape buffer table.*

- n. Will there be a primary inclusive play feature in this separate playground?

***Response:** Inclusive play elements and components have been added to playgrounds for children of different abilities.*

- o. Multi-purpose turf area should be equivalent in size to a standard soccer field (225' x 300') with a reasonably level slope.

***Response:** Multi-purpose area with a reasonably level slope has been added to the maximum extent possible. Topographic challenges prevent an area of 225x300 from being accommodated.*

- p. A Form J for this portion of Kings Point South which identifies the park and open space areas provided to satisfy land dedication requirements is needed. The form will enable PROS to evaluate if enough acreage is set aside as well as determine whether design criteria should apply to certain tracts.

***Response:** Design team will continue to work with PROS and Planning to update Form J as appropriate.*

- q. A subdivision plat showing the park and open space tracts with notes indicating their disposition (i.e., dedicated to the city or to be privately owned and maintained) should be provided with the second submittal.

***Response:** Noted and will be provided.*

15. Real Property:

- a. See the red line comments on the SP. Dedicate any easements by separate document and label as such. Contact Andy Niquette (aniquett@auroragov.org) for the easement concerns. Please note that the site plan cannot be approved until all the items needed are submitted, fully reviewed and ready to record.

Response: Noted.

- b. Is the legal description correct?

Response: Legal description has been updated.

- c. Add north arrow on vicinity map.

Response: North arrow added.

- d. Match the plat name, include "Subdivision".

Response: Noted and updated.

- e. Add the B&D and curve data around the boundary as well as the lot and tract lines of the platted area.

Response: To be provided.

- f. Match the easements as dedicated on the plat. Make sure the size and configurations are the same.

Response: Noted and updated.

- g. Add the B&D and curve data around the boundary as well as the lot and tract lines of the platted area.

Response: To be provided.

- h. Match the easements as dedicated on the plat. Make sure the size and configurations are the same.

Response: Noted and updated.

- i. Add the B&D and curve data around the boundary as well as the lot and tract lines of the platted area.

Response: To be provided.

- j. Match the easements as dedicated on the plat. Make sure the size and configurations are the same.

Response: Noted and updated.

16. Xcel Energy:

- a. Please note that the legal description information appears to be incorrect.

Response: Legal description has been updated.

- b. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas service via xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. Additional easements may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities.

Response: Noted.

17. Arapahoe County Public Works:

- a. Detention Basin D outfalls to twin 48" CMP culverts that pass under Parker Road and onto the 17 Mile House property owned by Arapahoe County Open Space. The Final Drainage Report for Kings Point Subdivision Filing No. 1 states that the peak 100-yr runoff through the twin 48" CMPs will be reduced to 111 cfs, which is below the capacity of the culvert.

Response: *This comment is for Kings Point North and is not relevant to the proposed Kings Point South Project.*

- b. Existing runoff from the culverts ultimately reaches Cherry Creek but there is no defined drainageway to convey the flows, which is correctly stated in the report. The County's concern is that the Kings Point Subdivision will create a base flow through the 17 Mile House property. This property is used for public events and at times the undefined drainageway is used for parking for these events. A base flow across the property would create a problem for the use of the open space.

Response: *N/A*

- c. The County would also like to note that the berm just southwest of the twin culverts has washed out before during a major storm event and flooded the 17 Mile House parking lot.

Response: *N/A*

- d. It is also our understanding the developer realigned Ireland Way to discourage cut-through traffic and Centennial agreed not to close Ireland Way at Longs Ave. Arapahoe County had some previous concerns with these 2 issues, if that has changed from the understanding please advise and continue correspondence with County to ensure the best outcomes for all our citizens.

Response: *N/A*

18. Arapahoe County Planning:

- a. No comments.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions about these comment responses.

Sincerely,

THK ASSOCIATES INC.



Julie Gamec, RLA , LEED AP BD+C, Assoc. AIA
Project Manager
303-770-7201