

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



June 6, 2017

Bruce Stokes
Kingspoint, LLC
3033 E 1st Avenue, Suite 305
Denver, CO 80206

Re: Second Submission Review – King's Point CSP No 2 and Plat
Application Number: **DA-1609-17**
Case Number: **2016-4013-00; 2016-3041-00**

Dear Mr. Stokes:

Thank you for your second submission, which we received on Monday, April 24, 2017. We reviewed it and attached our comments along with this cover letter.

Your estimated administrative decision date is set for Wednesday, June 28, 2017.

Since several important issues still remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before June 21, 2017.

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 give me a call. I may be reached at 303-739-7184 or hlanboy@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Heather L. Lamboy, Planning Supervisor
City of Aurora Planning Department

Cc: Mindy Parnes, Planning Department
Diana Rael, Norris Design, 1101 Bannock St, Denver, CO 80204
Eva Mather, Norris Design, 1101 Bannock St, Denver, CO 80204
Margee Cannon, Neighborhood Liaison
Gary Sandel, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\1609-17rev2.rtf



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Heather Lamboy / hlamboy@auroragov.org / 303-739-7184 / PDF comment color is green.

1. Community and External Agency Comments

1. During this review cycle staff received 1 comment from the public.

A. Name: Susan Harter

Address: Himalaya Way Centennial CO 80016

Phone: 720-308-7730

Email: susiemharter@gmail.com

I am very concerned about the access from Kings Point into Antelope subdivision and all the traffic it will bring through. We have narrow roads, no sidewalks, horses with horse trails and this will be the most direct route to Arapahoe Road and any roads to the north. We have children waiting on the side of the road daily and already have many extra cars and buses going through Antelope to two schools everyday! We have a gentleman in our neighborhood that is in a wheelchair and he and his work dog are on the street often and have to do that with no sidewalks extra pavement on the narrow roads. Our roads are definitely not built for construction traffic. I worry that Dry Creek Road or a Parker Road access will not be put in before construction starts. There is a huge parking problem and many cars parked along both sides of the road at Creekside Elem. during drop off and pick up times, this makes it very difficult to get through the road. I feel Kings Point should add additional parking on their side of the road if allowed to go ahead with the project. Antelope has always had a rural feeling even with all the growth, but know we will lose this from the thousands of cars that will drive by daily if Kings Point is allowed to drive through Antelope. What a huge safety issue it will be for us. It saddens me to think of the changes that will happen now after almost 33 years of living here.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

2. Address the following items:

A. Please make the corrections shown on the redlines throughout the Master Plan set.

B. Please address comments regarding the infrastructure from Craig Perl (Civil Engineering) and Victor Rachael (Traffic).

3. Phasing and Transportation Planning Issues

A. CDOT has provided comment regarding Aurora Parkway. Please continue to work with Victor Rachel and Rick Solomon regarding these comments.

4. Landscape Design Issues

Debbie Bickmire/ dbickmire@auroragov.org / (303) 739-7/ Comments in teal clouds.

4. Please address the following items:

A. There is a general issue that all trees are included in the Tract Landscape Table, including mitigation and transfers. The counts are not proving consistent with the number of trees in the provided column. Also, Note 1 on Sheet L1.04 states 88 required street trees may be located outside the ROW. How are trees differentiated from tract trees? A few tree counts have been shown in the table to demonstrate our tree count vs. what is shown. Additional information for the distribution of material is required and may result in additional comments.

B. Mitigation trees shall not be counted toward the landscape buffer requirement. If necessary, revise calculations and plans accordingly.

C. Tract total area references in the Tract Landscape Table differ from the references on the CSP sheets. Please revise.



- D. Not all transfers referenced in the notes are identified on the landscape sheets. All transfer trees should be marked with a "T".
- E. Note 4 on Sheet L1.03 states 20 TE have been relocated to Tract A. No transfers are noted in Tract A. Additionally, 32 trees are required in Tract A and we count 49 trees, not including mitigation trees. The math does not support 20 TE in Tract A.
- F. Landscape that is relocated/transferred to another tract shall not be counted toward the recipient tract's landscape. Relocated plants shall be over and above the requirement for the recipient tract.
- G. Revise title on sheets to include "with Waivers" as shown on redlines. Identify the waiver for column spacing, as well as the justification, on Sheet L1.01.
- H. Revise the notes on Sheet L1.01 as noted on the redlines.
- I. Add a detail for light poles to the CSP to demonstrate compliance with the FDP architectural standards.
- J. Show light poles on landscape plans, including lights proposed in the NAC and open space areas, if applicable. Add symbol to legend.
- K. Provide the calculations to demonstrate compliance for a maximum of 33% cool season grasses. Show in Hydro-zone Table on Sheet L5.01.
- L. The screen material around the playground parking lot is very seasonal. For example, maintenance of Russian sage calls for the plants to be cut back almost to the ground in late winter to early spring. Please replace or supplement with plant material that will provide more year round coverage. Screening should consist of a low continuous landscaped hedge between 2½ and 3 feet high consisting of a double row of shrubs planted 3 feet on center in a triangular pattern.
- M. Yucca is not an acceptable screen material and should not be used next to pedestrian areas. Please replace.
- N. Add colors to the materials descriptions for fences, columns and walls on Sheets L4.01 - L4.02.

5. Process

A. This CSP is being administratively reviewed. This case is scheduled for an administrative decision on June 28, 2017. You will be sent a notice of pending administrative decision no later than June 15, 2017; this will need to be mailed by June 17, 2017. Failure to notice will delay your administrative decision.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

6. Addressing

Cathryn Day, Planner II/GIS Addresser, cday@auroragov.org, 303-739-7357

A. Cathryn Day will provide street name revisions to applicant directly via e-mail.

7. Civil Engineering

Craig Perl, Senior Engineer - cperl@auroragov.org - 303-739-7532

A. Inconsistencies remain between roadway designations and right-of-way width. See specific conflicts marked in green on Site Plan and Plat, but also perform a full consistency check before resubmitting.

B. Suggest showing less detail on Antelope Creek, such as not showing check structures or riprap, as the channel design is subject to substantial revision, so these features shouldn't be shown on the CSP.

8. Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS)

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

A. Cash in lieu of community park land dedication in accordance with City of Aurora PROS standards is due prior to the recordation of first plat for Kings Point. Provide a certified appraisal for use in the land valuation for cash in lieu calculations.

B. If the applicant/developer has a recent appraisal report (generally dated within the past 6 months) or other document, such as an agreement of sale, we could review that to determine whether it adequately reflect an estimated market value for the site. The document would be looked at both by PROS and Real Property Services staff to ensure the value is in accordance with City Code.



C. Alternatively, the city's Real Property Services staff could generate a per-acre value based on their knowledge and judgement of the market. This option is sometimes used if the developer doesn't have a recent appraisal or wants to avoid going to the expense of hiring an appraiser. No report or written analysis is prepared. All that is provided is a per-acre value for consideration. The applicant/developer isn't bound to accept the city's number and has the option to still produce an appraisal or agreement with an alternative number for the city to review.

9. Forestry

Jacque Chomiak / jchomiak@auroragov.org / 303-739-7178

A. The inches added into the Landscape Plan fulfill the tree loss that needs to be replaced for Filing 2. However, the TPP still needs to be refined and it was not included in this set of submittals.

10. Real Property

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

A. As of the date of this review letter, no comments have been received.

11. Life Safety

John J. Van Essen, Plan Examiner III, (303) 739-7489, jvanesse@auroragov.org

A. No comments at this time.

12. Traffic

Reviewed by: Victor Rachael / vrachael@auroragov.org / (303) 739-7309

A. The Traffic Impact Study is under review in a parallel process. The Study has been referred to the Colorado Department of Transportation for review.

13. Aurora Water

Reviewed by: Jonathan Villines / jvilline@auroragov.org / (303) 739-7646 / Comments are in red.

A. Please see redlines on the Utility Plan. Important issues to discuss include pressure zone transitions and ensuring proper infrastructure is in place for a future booster pump. Contact Jonathan Villines to schedule a meeting.

14. Xcel Energy

Reviewed by: Donna George, Right of Way & Permits / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com / (303) 571-3524

A. PSCo's Referral Desk acknowledges the comment response and requested changes that were made to the plat and has no further concerns.

15. Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT)

Reviewed by: Richard Solomon, Region One Permit Unit Supervisor / richard.solomon@state.co.us / (303) 757-9345

A. Comments were provided as part the of CSP #1 review. While that mostly refers to the Parker Road intersection, you may want to refer to the comments to see if there are any implications in CSP #2.