

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



November 23, 2022

Randy Bauer
Clayton Properties Group II / Oakwood Homes
4908 Tower Road
Denver, Colorado 80249

Re: Fourth Submission Review – Kings Point North West – Site Plan (ISP)
Application Number: **DA-1609-20**
Case Numbers: **2021-6058-00**

Dear Mr. Bauer:

Thank you for your fourth submission, which we started to process on October 26th, 2022. 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 issues remain, you will need to make a technical submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission after your administrative decision date of December 7th, 2022.

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 administrative decision date is tentatively set for December 7th, 2022. As the administrative decision date approaches, remember to coordinate with your case manager regarding the notice of pending administrative decision and administrative decision hearing signs. The notice of pending administrative decision is required to be sent to abutting property owners at least 10 days prior to the decision date and the signs are required to be posted on-site a minimum of 10 days prior to the decision date.

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.

Sincerely,

Erik Gates, Planner I
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Layla Rosales, Terracina Design
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\1600-1699\1609-20rev4



Fourth Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- A number of notes are needed on the ISP and Landscape Plan. [Various Departments]
- The site plan will not be approved by Public Works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved. [Civil Engineering]
- A number of corrections and clarifications are requested for the roundabout. [Traffic Engineering]
- Various labeling and dimensioning corrections are requested in relation to utilities and easements. [Aurora Water]
- This site plan will not be fully approved until Tree Protection Plan has been approved [Forestry]
- Continue to work on License Agreements and Easement Dedications. [Real Property]

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. There were no community comments on this review.

2. Planning Comments (Comments in teal)

[ISP Page 1]

2A. Please include an amendment block on this title page to track any future amendments to this plan.

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

[ISP Page 1]

3A. Remove this. Water can be extended from the adjacent streetscape.

[Landscape Plan Page 1]

3B. Provide the remaining required landscape notes. A note regarding the proposed lighting as well as the note regarding future installation, maintenance, and replacement of landscaping. Refer to the Cover Sheet regarding the wording of this note and refer to the Landscape Reference Manual.

3C. The landscape plans are part of the overall Site Plan submittal package and therefore the title block for all the sheets should be consistent; the sheet numbering as well.

[Landscape Plan Page 18]

3D. LP.17 is missing from this plan set. The next sheet is LP.18.

4. Planning Transportation (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7340 / tworker@auroragov.org)

4A. There were no more comments from Planning Transportation on this review.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

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

[ISP Page 1]

5A. The site plan will not be approved by Public Works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.

5B. Add the following required site plan notes:

‘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.’

‘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 photometric 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 the site location of lights, electrical one line, and grounding details shall be submitted 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.' 'Prior to final acceptance of public improvements, if the adjacent site is not under construction, the curb cut/curb returns, and the cross pan must be removed and replaced with sidewalk, landscaping, and curb and gutter at the developer's expense. The developer acknowledges the risk of constructing the curb cut without approved civil plans for the adjacent site showing the curb cut.'

6. Traffic Engineering (Steven Gomez / 303-739-7300 / segomez@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

[ISP Page 1]

- 6A. This ISP will not be approved until the Kings Point North/Prairie Point Master documents have been approved.
- 6B. Previous comment not addressed- Add a note:
'The developer is responsible for signing and striping all public streets. The developer is required to place traffic control, street name, and guide signs on all public streets and private streets approaching an intersection with a public street. Signs shall be furnished and installed per the most current editions of The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) and City Standards and shown on the signing and striping plan for the development.'
- 6C. Replace Note:
'(Applicant/owner name, address, phone) shall be responsible for payment of 50% of the traffic signalization costs for the intersection of Aurora Parkway and Parker Road, when traffic signal warrants are satisfied. Traffic signal warrants to consider shall be as described in the most recently adopted version of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, as of the date or dates of any such warrant studies. For warranty purposes, the minor street approach traffic shall typically be comprised of all through and left-turn movements and 50% of right-turn movements unless otherwise determined by the traffic engineer. Pursuant to 147-37.5 of city code, the percentage of the traffic signalization costs identified above shall be paid to the city by the applicant/owner, to be held in escrow for such purpose, prior to the issuance of a building permit for the related development or as otherwise required by city code. The percentage above will be applied to the entire traffic signalization cost as estimated at the time of the escrow deposit to calculate specific dollar funding requirements.'

[ISP Page 7]

- 6D. Provide a design checks package (Geometric speeds (fast paths), swept path of trucks, sight distance (SSD and ISD), and a dimensioned layout. See the example in the pages following this sheet, per Road Design Manual Section 2)
- 6E. Provide signing and marking on separate sheets per Road Design Manual Section 2.10.3 (2017).
- 6F. Show YIELD line as 18" x 2 x 2 (Typical)
- 6G. Redevelop the west leg geometry to prevent the right lane from having easier access to the circle (Path overlap). Separate the RT-only lane into a yielding bypass lane using a vane island or separation island. Ensure that the RT lane is 'snagged' i.e., its trajectory does not favor using it to make a faster path into the roundabout.
- 6H. Do not build a two-lane circulatory that is fed by a single lane upstream. Strip it back to a single lane either off the face of the splitter island or the central island to restrict the width to approximately 18ft.
- 6I. Confirm truck apron width for WB-67 left-turns or U-turns.
- 6J. Don't mark the crossing until the leg is opened.
- 6K. Bullnose doesn't exist if the splitter island is raised up to the circle.
- 6L. Use conventional MUTCD arrows, not 'fish-hook' markings.
- 6M. Remove the breaks in diagonal hatching.
- 6N. Add tactile truncated domes at the 'top' of the ramp.
- 6O. Remove solid marking and diagonal hatch pattern. Just use skip white markings to end the bike lane. See the pasted bike lane termination image to the right.
- 6P. Confirm the 18ft. face of curb dimension for minimum entry and exit widths. Prove width is suitable for a bus and a City Fire Truck not needing the truck apron.



6Q. Confirm 18ft. face of curb dimension for minimum circulating width. Prove width is suitable for a bus and a City Fire Truck not needing the truck apron.

[ISP Page 9]

6R. Entry widths may need to be slightly more than 28ft. to keep a WB-50 in the lane. Use a gore striping pattern to separate 2 - 12ft. lanes.

6S. This is excessive for a two-lane exit. Revise to 28ft. Excessive lane widths lead to excess speeds and poor lane discipline. Trucks larger than WB-50 and a City fire truck do not need to stay in the lane.

6T. Revise to 28ft. max 2- 12ft. lanes plus 2ft. gutters/shy distance.

6U. This is excessive for a circulating width of 2 lanes. Use a maximum of 28ft. 2- 12ft. lanes plus 2 x 2ft. gutters.

6V. The minimum bullnose radius (face of curb dimension) is 3 ft.

[Landscape Plan Page 3]

6W. Add and verify all intersection triangles are per COA TE-13.

[Landscape Plan Page 5]

6X. Add intersection sight triangles per COA TE-13.

[Landscape Plan Page 11]

6Y. These sight triangles are not consistent with COA TE-13, update.

7. Fire / Life Safety (Mike Dean / 303-739-7447 / mdean@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

7A. There were no more comments from Fire/Life Safety on this review.

8. Aurora Water (Nina Khanzadeh / 303-883-2060 / nkhanzad@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

[ISP Page 1]

8A. Would recommend including Prairie Point in the title to clear up confusion in the future.

[ISP Page 4]

8B. Previous comment responses stated that sheets 1-4 would identify future ROW. Please show on these sheets.

[ISP Page 5]

8C. Previous comment responses stated that sheets 1-4 would identify future ROW. Please show on these sheets.

[ISP Page 10]

8D. See note on the cover sheet. Need to define plan set, multiple names can get confusing.

[ISP Page 12]

8E. Note that valves and flange elevations, etc. to be included in Civil Plans- Typical.

8F. Identify. Size? Ownership? Indicate if existing. It is currently a different line type than what is being used for the proposed.

[ISP Page 13]

8G. Stub?

8H. Width of the bottom portion of the easement?

8I. Cut-off text here.

8J. Indicate on utility pages, where future ROW is on utility pages- Typical.

8K. According to MUS, lines going northeast from Aurora Parkway are 8"- confirm.

8L. If the storm is to be maintained by Aurora, include that Storm lines to be maintained by Aurora Water, unless otherwise noted. -Typical.

[ISP Page 14]

8M. Label: Private

8N. Easements are not required for the private storm- however, it is up to your discretion if you would like a "private" drainage easement – Typical.

8O. Are these dashed items to be included in the ISP for the eastern portion? Clarify- Typical all sheets.

8P. Is this within the ROW? If not, an easement is needed.

8Q. This preference is to have any public utility outside of any concrete medians- Typical. Is there any way to adjust this?



[ISP Page 15]

8R. Is this King's Point Dr as listed on MUS? Please include in parentheses to avoid confusion- Typical all sheets.

[ISP Page 16]

8S. Street names are missing as compared to the other keymaps.

8T. Is this meant to be extended to the south where the UE is located?

8U. Size?

8V. Why so large for just a blow-off?

8W. Note all hydrants are to be in landscaped areas.

8X. Identify ROW limits

8Y. If outside of ROW easement is needed.

8Z. Size? PRV vault to also be within easement if outside of ROW.

[ISP Page 17]

8AA. Stub outside of UE.

8BB. Preference is to have water sampling stations off a hydrant in a landscaped area in a park. Are any parks presented in this portion of King's Point? Include in PA-4 according to MUS.

[ISP Page 18]

8CC. Where is the 24" water to connect to the 12"?

8DD. What is this serving?

[ISP Page 19]

8EE. Need more information on this keymap.

8FF. Sizes?

8GG. Label as private.

[ISP Page 20]

8HH. Need more information on this keymap.

8II. Note that the slope is to be limited to 4:1 for maintenance staff to access vehicles.

8JJ. Size?

8KK. Label: Private [two comments]

[ISP Page 21]

8LL. Need more information on this keymap.

[ISP Page 26]

8MM. Call out maintenance path for all ponds- Typical.

9. Forestry (Rebecca Lamphear / 303-739-7177 / rlamphea@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

[ISP Page 1]

9A. This site plan will not be approved until Tree Protection Plan has been approved.

10. Real Property (John Doose / 970-379-0008 / jdoose@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

10A. Continue to work on the license Agreements (licenseagreement@auroragov.org) and the Easement Dedications with Andy Niquette (aniquett@auroragov.org).

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

11A. MHFD staff have no objections to the referenced project at the present time. We appreciate the opportunity to review this application and look forward to working with you as the drainage design progresses.