



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

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

March 19, 2020

Derrick Hoffman
DR Horton
9555 S Kingston Court
Englewood, CO 80112

Re: Initial Submission Review: Citadel on Colfax Residential – Master Plan Amendment, Site Plan and Plat
Application Number: DA-1422-16
Case Number: 2017-6017-08; 2021-3007-00; 2021-4004-00

Dear Mr. Hoffman:

Thank you for your initial submission, which we started to process on February 22, 2021. We reviewed it 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, adjacent property owners, and outside agencies.

Since many 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 April 8, 2021 to remain on schedule.

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 303-739-7857.

Sincerely,

Sarah Wile, AICP
Senior Planner, City of Aurora
Planning & Development Services Department

cc: Jeff Weeder, Galloway & Company, 6162 S Willow Drive Suite 320, Greenwood Village, CO 80111
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\1422-16rev1.rtf



Initial Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Reach out to adjacent property owner to discuss their concerns (see Item 1)
- Include additional sheets in the Master Plan Amendment and coordinate with other ongoing amendment to ensure consistency (see Item 2)
- Revise how the lots are being platted to not include easements or common spaces (see Item 3)
- Request additional adjustments from the UDO as needed (see Item 4)
- Address issues with proposed street sections, include parking width and lack of street trees (see Item 5)
- Provide complete building elevations with the next submittal and make improvements to them (see Item 6)
- Address issues with curbside landscaping, building perimeter landscaping, and landscape buffers (see Item 8)
- Revise the Site Plan to depict that all alleys must be concrete (see Item 9)
- Enhance the east / west pedestrian connections and ensure compliance with sight triangles (see Item 10)
- Change the utility design to comply with Aurora Water requirements (see Item 11)
- Review requirements and fees from PROS (see Item 12)
- Address comments from Fire / Life Safety (see Item 13)
- Ensure the Site Plan and Plat are consistent per Real Property comments (see Item 14)
- Respond to comments from Xcel Energy and Aurora Public Schools (see Items 15 and 16)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. Referrals were sent to 24 adjacent property owners and 8 registered neighborhood organizations. One comment was received from an adjacent property owner voicing concerns about noise, views, and the need for a retaining wall. Staff does not believe a formal neighborhood meeting is warranted at this time because only one comment was received, but please reach out to Mr. Dobson and set up a phone call with him to discuss these concerns. Please provide a summary of your conversation with him when you resubmit.

Name: Everett Dobson

Email: tonyadobson46@yahoo.com

Comment: *Is there a way of putting a retaining wall up between our property. On the side of the old Kmart there is a wall. We need a retaining wall there because of the increase of noise and also there are a lot of bushes that I have requested that come down and they did not get rid of them like they had promised and also we just need to have a wall so we can have less of the noise with increase of the driving behind us. This will also take away our view of the mountains because of the property.*

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

2A. Please update the Letter of Introduction to add, clarify, or revise information as requested in the redline comments.

2B. There are many other sheets that need to be updated within the Citadel on Colfax Master Plan besides just the two that were submitted. The new streets, planning areas, and landscaping all need to be depicted accurately in the Master Plan. Please include these with the next submittal. In addition, there needs to be coordination with the other Master Plan Amendment that is ongoing. That amendment will likely be approved before this one, so all changes associated with this amendment need to be clearly labeled as Amendment #3. Amendment #2 should still be reflected in the submitted sheets though.



2C. Please change the title of this Site Plan to “Citadel on Colfax Townhomes” instead of “Citadel on Colfax Residential.” The other Master Plan Amendment that is under review is adding multi-family as a potential land use to several PAs, so the title should be more specific about the type of residential since there could be more than one. In addition, the title should clearly state “Site Plan with Adjustments” on all sheets. See additional comments on the Cover Sheet.

2D. Revise sheet numbering to remove “of 28” from all sheets in case additional sheets are added with future amendments.

2E. When referencing the adjacent PAs (PA-5 and PA-6) on the Site Plan, please include the associated Case Numbers for those applications.

2F. Remove the adjacent property owners of the lots surrounding the site on all sheets as those are not needed.

2G. The Landscape Plan includes building numbers for each group of townhome units, but they are not referenced on the other sheets in the Site Plan. Please add these to all sheets with the next submittal for consistency purposes.

2H. Please ensure that all AutoCAD SHX text items are removed from the “Comment” section during the PDF creation process and that the sheets are flattened to reduce ability to select items. The next submittal will not be accepted if this is not fixed on the Plat as it makes it difficult for staff to review the document.

2I. The city has developed [CAD Data Submittal Standards](#) for internal and external use to streamline the process of importing AutoCAD information into the City's Enterprise GIS. A digital submission meeting the CAD Data Submittal Standards is required before final mylars can be routed for signatures or recorded for all applications. Please review these standards and ensure that files are in the correct format to avoid future delays.

3. Zoning and Land Use Issues

3A. Please include the dimensions and square footage of all lots in the Site Plan. The Site Plan and Plat should match.

3B. The proposed platting of the lots is not acceptable as shown. The access and utility easements (alleys) should be platted as separate tracts like the private streets. They should not be platted as part of each individual lot. Please revise this with the next submittal and request an Adjustment for lot size given that most of the lots will be under 1,600 square feet.

3C. The proposed east-west pedestrian connections should not be part of the individual lots, they should be dedicated as tracts. Encouraging pedestrians to walk through private property is a maintenance and liability concern and is not supported. Please show these as tracts with the next submittal.

3C. Please add more information to the Typical Lot Detail per redline comments on Sheet 3.

3D. What will the typical grading look like between the sidewalk and the porch? Will there be steps from the sidewalk to the porch or will the porch be at ground level? This is important as staff evaluates the front setback adjustment. Providing a cross section that shows how the house sits relative to the street, sidewalk, and porch would be helpful.

3E. If any monument signs are proposed, they need to be shown on the Site Plan and a detail of the monument sign base should be included.



3F. Please clarify who will be responsible for maintenance of the access and utility easements (alleys) and the east-west pedestrian connections.

3G. Show the locations of all resident mailboxes on the Site Plan.

4. Adjustments

4A. Based on the current proposal, additional adjustments would be required beyond the front setback adjustment, including for lot sizes and landscaping. Please review all comments in this review letter and include any additional adjustment requests with the next submittal. Staff cannot comment on whether the adjustment request(s) will be supported until all requested information is received.

4B. On the Cover Sheet, please change “Waivers” to “Adjustments.” For each adjustment that is requested, please also state what the adjustment is for (i.e. an adjustment is requested to reduce the front setback from 15’ to x’) instead of just stating “front setback,” for example.

4C. In the Letter of Introduction, please add a section that is specifically for adjustment requests. Additional detail is needed about what code section the adjustment is requested from, what the specific adjustment request is, how the impacts of the adjustment are being mitigated, and why you believe it meets the major adjustment approval criteria. This applies to all adjustments that may be requested.

5. Streets, Pedestrian, and Parking Issues

5A. Please coordinate with Phil Turner to receive street names prior to the next submittal. This will make it easier to review the street cross sections. See Item 7.

5B. The sidewalks that lead to the future dog park (between Lots 10 and 11 of Block 1) should be extended to the west so that residents can easily access this area.

5C. Per Section 146-4.6.5.D.6, parallel parking spaces are supposed to be 8’ wide. The current spaces along the street are only shown as 7’ wide.

5D. Curbside landscaping is required for all streets, regardless of whether they are public or private. The proposed cross sections do not include any landscaping, which is not consistent with the UDO or the approved Master Plan. See Item 8 for additional information.

5E. Per Traffic Engineering comment, provide pedestrian lights, crosswalks, and signage at the east-west midblock pedestrian connections.

6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

6A. Building elevations are required for all building types, including the 4-plex and 6-plex buildings. Include with the next submittal.

6B. The setup of the building elevations within the Site Plan is not acceptable. Staff needs to see the entire set of building elevations for each architectural style (i.e. Colorado Farmhouse, Colorado Ranch, Traditional Craftsman, etc.), not just how a single unit of each style looks. Staff cannot evaluate whether the building elevations meet the UDO requirements as currently shown because they do not show how an entire building would actually look.

6C. All of the architectural styles shown in the provided building elevation look very similar and all appear to use the same materials. The architectural styles should be more distinctive so all of the buildings do not look the same. This is especially important because the same product is proposed for this entire site, so architectural and color variation is needed to reduce monotony.



6D. Once you have provided a 4-plex, 5-plex, and 6-plex elevation for each architectural style, please also include a key map that identifies each building and calls out which style will be used for each building so that staff can ensure there is diversity on each street.

6E. For each architectural style, also include at least 3 color schemes so that there is not repetition on the same block. Please utilize accent colors and vary the color palette so that all buildings are not just gray or tan.

6F. All building materials and features need to be called out on the elevations, as well as the building heights.

6G. Please include masonry calculations for each architectural style / building type with the next submittal. Single-family attached homes require that 50% be clad in brick or stone, 75% be clad in stucco, or 75% be clad in a combination of brick and stucco, or stone and stucco.

6H. Do the end units feature a wraparound porch as shown in the current building elevations? It doesn't appear so from the provided building footprints. Please clarify. The building elevations need to accurately depict what is proposed for these buildings. The elevations in the Site Plan need to match what is submitted with building permits.

7. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7271 / pcturner@auroragov.org)

7A. Please submit a preliminary digital addressing .SHP or a .DWG file as soon as possible. This digital file is used for street naming, addressing and preliminary GIS analysis. Include parcels, street lines and building footprints (if available) at minimum. Please ensure that the digital file is provided in the correct projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. More information can be found [here](#).

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

General Comment

8A. Both the UDO and the Master Plan require the installation of street trees. The current Landscape Plan does not comply with the UDO and the approved Master Plan.

Sheet 20

8B. Update the Plant Schedule table to either include the quantity of deciduous trees or remove them from the table if there are tree species not being provided. This also applies to the evergreen trees, shrubs, grasses and perennials.

8C. 20% of the trees are required to be upsized to 3" per the Planning Area.

8D. Update the City of Aurora Landscape Notes and Building Perimeter Landscape table per redline comments.

8E. Provide the required building perimeter landscaping or request an adjustment. While shrubs have been provided to offset the lack of trees, the shrub quantities are not being met as a whole.

8F. Provide a landscape table for the eastern buffer.

8G. If the green spaces provided between certain buildings are going to be tracts, provide the required tract landscaping and table.

Sheet 21

8H. If open space areas between some of the homes are to represent green connections, they should not be part of adjoining lots. They should be treated as a tract and tract landscaping should be provided and documented in a table. Residents should not be trespassing on private property.

8I. If the dog park area is to be installed by the Master Developer, then it should be grayed back and a note added to the plan stating that.



8J. Dimension the provided buffer. It is supposed to be 25' along this eastern property line. The buffer width and the buffer plant material have not been provided and therefore is not compliance with the UDO.

8K. Darken the property line all landscape sheets.

8L. Show all proposed utilities. There is a storm line running north south in the buffer area.

Sheet 23

8M. Fix the sheet numbering to reflect 22.

8N. Correct the tree labels per redline comments.

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

9A. The Site Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the Preliminary Drainage Report is approved.

9B. On Sheet 2, please label the streets that are currently constructed.

9C. Alleys are required to be concrete.

9D. It does not appear from aerial imagery that street lights, signs, or crosswalks have been installed yet, but they are labeled as existing.

9E. Mid-block lights will be required. Add a note that street light locations are conceptual. Final street light locations are determined with the photometric analysis submitted with the street lighting plan in the Civil Plan submittal.

9F. There are no fire lane easements dedicated.

9G. Show the existing curb ramps.

9H. Indicate the material type and maximum height (or height range) of the retaining wall. A railing or barrier is required for all walls greater than 30".

9I. Include the appropriate street names for the street sections.

9J. Include the 100-year water surface elevation for the existing pond. The adjacent lowest FFEs must be a minimum of 2' above the 100-year water surface elevation.

9K. Review comments regarding minimum and maximum slopes on Sheets 9-12.

9L. Ensure a minimum of 10' between any tree and storm sewer.

10. Traffic Engineering (Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / bmedema@auroragov.org / Comments in orange)

10A. The Traffic Letter has been approved.

10B. Ensure all counted on-street parking spaces meet the city's setback standards. The setback is 5' for driveways, 15' for fire hydrants, and 30' for stop signs and traffic signals.

10C. Where are the ADA ramps, crosswalk, and pedestrian connection signage for the east-west pedestrian connections?



10D. For the east-west pedestrian crossings, a tract would be appropriate for the sidewalk and ramp location. Also include pedestrian lighting, mid-block crosswalks, and signage.

10E. Add sight triangles per COA STD TE-13.1.

10F. Revise the sight triangle note on Sheet 20.

10G. Review plantings within sight triangles per redline comments on Sheet 20.

11. Aurora Water (Steve Dekoskie / 303-739-7490 / sdekoski@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

11A. The proposed utility design does not conform to Aurora Water design standards. All lots are required to have frontage to public water and sanitary sewer mains for service. The banked water meters depicted are not permitted. Utility plans must be revised to show public water and sewer mains fronting each lot served. Show / label 10' pocket easements for the water meter. Service lines are not permitted to cross lot lines or run parallel with utility easements. License agreements would be needed for encroachments into utility easements. See redline comments.

11B. 5/8" water meters should be provided for residential.

12. PROS (Curtis Bish / 303-739-7131 / cbish@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

Other Active Amendments

12A. There is another active submittal (#1496120) being processed by the Planning Department which deals with amendments to the Master Plan. Depending on the timing of approvals, your amendments to the sheets may need to reflect the newly updated sheets from the other application. Some of those changes address the design of the Small Urban Park (SUP) which is intended to help satisfy the neighborhood park requirements for your project and other future residential phases within Citadel on Colfax.

SUP Construction

12B. The master developer had accepted responsibility to construct, own and maintain the SUP. You are encouraged to coordinate with the master developer regarding timing of construction of the park as it should be completed prior to issuance of 50% of the Certificates of Occupancy for your project. Again, the SUP is supposed to help to satisfy the close-to-home recreation needs for your project, so it must be built and available for use by the new homeowners that move in.

Cash-in-Lieu of Land Dedication

12C. Similarly, you should also coordinate with the master developer regarding payment of cash-in-lieu for the balance of the park land dedication requirements not being met on-site. Payment of cash-in-lieu of land dedication is required prior to recordation of your plat. The payment amount has been recalculated to reflect the increased unit count based on your proposed master plan amendment and using an updated per-acre value for Citadel on Colfax, which qualifies as a transit station area development. Below is a summary of the fee calculation: *Required Land Dedication based on 260 transit station area dwelling units*: 1.89 acres of community park land, comprised of 1.31 acres of neighborhood park land and 0.58 acres of community park land. This project receives credit for 0.27 acres of small urban parks provided on-site, which partially satisfies the total neighborhood park land dedication requirement. This project is also exempt from open space land dedication; *Land Value*: \$60,200 / acre; *Cash-in-Lieu Payment*: \$113,778.

Park Development Fees

12D. Park Development Fees will be paid by you, the builder of the residential units, at time of building permit issuance. Because credit is given for the SUP, the per-unit fee to be collected will be \$1,291.56 per unit if permits for the project are pulled this year.



Site Plan Notes

12E. Please add notes somewhere on the Site Plan to acknowledge the above requirements and how they are proposed to be satisfied. Also, be advised that the monetary calculations for the requirements are estimates based on the per-acre value for transit station area development and park construction costs in effect at this point in time (current year 2021). The timing for implementation of the project may affect the ultimate amount of fees collected and other payments imposed to satisfy park-related obligations.

13. Fire / Life Safety (John Van Essen / 303-739-7489 / jvanesse@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Sheet 1

13A. Per the 2015 International Residential Code, Section R320.1, where there are four or more dwelling units or sleeping units in a single structure, the provisions of Chapter 11 of the International Building Code for Group R-3 shall apply.

13B. Add an Implementation Plan to the Site Plan and show compliance to the House Bill 1221 and the 2015 IBC Chapter 11.

13C. Add “Unsprinklered” to the Data Block.

Sheet 2

13D. Please add existing Fire Hydrants to all Legends.

13E. Add the existing Fire Hydrant.

13F. Show and label all mail kiosks on the Site Plan so that proper accessibility can be verified.

Sheet 6

13G. Add the two missing existing Fire Hydrants.

13H. Delete the mis-located Fire Hydrant.

Sheet 7

13I. Fire Lane signs will not be required, please delete.

13J. Add the street names to the street sections and label the private streets to the public standards.

13K. Address miscellaneous redline comments on the Site Plan.

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

14A. There are some easement and License Agreement issues. See the comments on the document(s). Contact Andy Niquette (aniquett@auroragov.org) for the easement concerns and Grace Gray (ggray@auroragov.org) for the License Agreement concerns. Please note that the Site Plan cannot be approved until all the items needed are submitted, fully reviewed and ready to record.

14B. The Site Plan and Plat must match. Please review all redline comments and address discrepancies.

14C. Address all redline comments on the Subdivision Plat and send in the requested documents.

15. Xcel Energy (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

15A. See the attached comment letter.



16. Aurora Public Schools (Josh Hensley / 303-365-7812 / jdhensley@aurorak12.org)

16A. In accordance with Section 146-4.3.18 of the Unified Development Ordinance, the school land dedication obligation for the 141 proposed townhomes is .9271 acres. Aurora Public Schools will accept cash-in-lieu of land for this obligation valued at market value of zoned land with infrastructure in place. Cash-in-lieu is due at the time of recording of the Subdivision Plat.



Right of Way & Permits

1123 West 3rd Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80223
Telephone: **303.571.3306**
Facsimile: 303. 571.3284
donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com

February 26, 2021

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

Attn: Sarah Wile

Re: Citadel on Colfax Residential, Case # DA-1422-16

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the subdivision plat and site plans for **Citadel on Colfax Residential**. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to any existing facilities 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 (i.e. transformers) – be sure to contact the Designer and request that they connect with a Right-of-Way and Permits Agent in this event. Should there be any PSCo documents to be vacated by separate document, Russ McClung, Right-of-Way Agent at russel.w.mcclung@xcelenergy.com, must be contact in order to process any necessary quitclaim deeds.

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

AURORA PUBLIC SCHOOLS - STUDENT YIELD

3/11/2021

Citadel on Colfax Residential - DA-1422-16

Dwelling Type	Units	Yield Ratio	Student Yield
SFD		0.7	0
MF-LOW	141	0.3	42
MF-HIGH		0.145	0
TOTAL	141		42

YIELD	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE SCHOOL		K-8 TOTAL	HIGH SCHOOL		K-12
	RATIO	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	TOTAL
SF	0.34	0	0.16	0	0	0.2	0	0
MF-LOW	0.17	24	0.08	11	35	0.05	7	42
MF-HIGH	0.075	0	0.04	0	0	0.03	0	0
TOTAL		24		11	35		7	42

SCHOOL TYPE	STUDENT YIELD	ACRES PER CHILD	ACRES REQUIRED
ELEMENTARY	24	0.0175	0.4195
MIDDLE	11	0.025	0.2820
HIGH	7	0.032	0.2256
TOTAL	42		0.9271