

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



September 7, 2022

Jason Pock  
Richmond American Homes of Colorado Inc.  
4350 S Monaco St., Ste 500  
Denver, CO 80237-3400

**Re: Second Submission Review** – Harvest Crossing PA 5, 6, & 7 – Master Plan Amendment, Site Plan, & Plat  
Application Number: **DA-1786-03**  
Case Numbers: **2005-7007-03, 2022-4017-00, 2022-3049-00**

Dear Mr. Pock.

Thank you for your second submission, which we started to process on August 11, 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 important issues remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before September 21, 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 Planning Commission date is set for October 26, 2022. Please remember that all abutter notices and site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the hearing date. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause your hearing decision date to be postponed. It is important that you obtain an updated list of adjacent property owners from the county before the notices are sent out. Take all necessary steps to ensure an accurate list is obtained.

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](mailto:egates@auroragov.org).

Sincerely,

Erik Gates  
Planner

cc: Allison Hibbs, Plan West.  
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison  
Cesarina Dancy, ODA  
Filed: K:\SDA\1700-1799\1786-03rev2



## *Second Submission Review*

### **SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS**

- Double-fronted lots are not permitted along local or collector streets even with a buffer, an adjustment request will be needed to be approved by the Planning Commission for these lots.
- Add a legend to a landscaping lot typical sheet that depicts what the plant symbols represent i.e. shrubs, grasses, etc.
- The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.
- Several grading issues have been identified by Civil Engineering.
- Add pedestrian ramps where identified in the site plan and show receiving ramps.
- A phasing plan with a descriptive narrative must be provided with the Planning Departments' site plan and Public Works Departments' civil plan submittal.
- Storm drain development fees due: 124.054 acres x \$1,242.00 = \$154,075.07.
- PROS has raised a question regarding where a deficit in land dedication will be made up.
- Send in the Certificate of Taxes Due, State Monument Records for the aliquot corners used in the plat, and the copy of the Deed of Trust document to Real Property.
- See the comment letter provided by Mile High Flood District.

### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

#### **1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns**

1A. There are no community comments on this first review cycle.

#### **2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application**

2A. There were no completeness or clarity comments on this review.

#### **3. Zoning and Land Use Comments**

[Site Plan Page 1]

3A. This number does not match the 23% number found on the third page.

[Site Plan Page 3]

3B. This number does not match the 29% number on the first page data block.

#### **4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues**

[Site Plan Page 3]

4A. The UDO does not permit double-fronted lots on local or collector streets even with a buffer. Both Harvest and Kewaunee are classified as a collector and local respectively. An adjustment request will need to be made and reviewed by the Planning Commission for these lots.

[Letter of Introduction]

4B. An adjustment request will need to be made and reviewed by the Planning Commission for the double-fronted lots. Please update your letter of introduction to address the approval criteria found in [Section 146-5.4.4.D.3](#) of the UDO.

#### **5. Parking Issues**

5A. There were no Parking comments on this review.



## **6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues**

[Site Plan Throughout]

6A. Ensure all privacy fencing is set back 4ft from the back of the sidewalk. The lot typicals appear to show this, but the landscaping sheets themselves seem to show this space inconsistently.

[Site Plan Page 35]

6B. Dimension the fence setback. Should be at least 4 ft.

[Site Plan Page 36]

6C. Dimension the fence setback. Should be at least 4 ft.

[Site Plan Page 39]

6D. All wood fencing needs to have a top rail.

## **7. Signage Issues**

[Site Plan Page 1]

7A. Provide a detail of the monument signs with dimensions. Do not include sign copy.

## **8. Landscaping Issues (Tammy Cook / 954-684-0532 / [tdcook@auroragov.org](mailto:tdcook@auroragov.org) / Comments in bright teal)**

[Site Plan Page 28]

8A. This tree is within 50 feet of a stop sign, please remove it.

[Site Plan Page 34]

8B. Add the plant symbology here.

[Site Plan Page 35]

8C. All lot typicals should include any proposed easements and the approximate locations of the utilities i.e. water and sewer.

8D. Add a legend to this sheet that depicts what the plant symbols represent i.e. shrubs, grasses etc.

8E. Only 50% of the mulch treatment may be rock. The remainder must be inorganic.

8F. P.U.E.

## **9. Public Art (Roberta Bloom / 303-739-6747 / [rbloom@auroragov.org](mailto:rbloom@auroragov.org))**

9A. There were no more comments from Public Art on this review.

## **10. Transportation Planning (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7340 / [tworker@auroragov.org](mailto:tworker@auroragov.org) / Comments in light blue)**

10A. There were no comments from Transportation Planning in this review cycle.

## **REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

### **11. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7300 / [jbingham@auroragov.org](mailto:jbingham@auroragov.org) / Comments in green)**

[Site Plan Page 1]

11A. The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.

[Site Plan Page 2]

11B. Label as a sidewalk easement.

11C. If the tracts are not dedicated as drainage tracts, a drainage easement needs to be provided to encompass the proposed detention ponds.

11D. Include the RSN for the plan set constructing this half.

[Site Plan Page 4]

11E. Provide receiving ramps for these ramps.

11F. The sidewalk should remain detached around the cul-de-sac.

[Site Plan Page 5]

11G. Include the RSN if there is one.

11H. Will there be enough room for a driveway for this lot?



- 11I. Curb ramps are required to be shown at all T intersections on one side, typical.  
[Site Plan Page 6]
- 11J. Will there be enough room for a driveway for this lot?  
[Site Plan Page 7]
- 11K. Curb ramps are required to be shown at all T intersections on one side, typical. [2 comments]  
[Site Plan Page 8]
- 11L. Dimension the walks, typical.
- 11M. The sidewalk should remain detached around the cul-de-sac.  
[Site Plan Page 10]
- 11N. Provide a receiving ramp at this T intersection.  
[Site Plan Page 11]
- 11O. The sidewalk should remain detached around the cul-de-sac.  
[Site Plan Page 14]
- 11P. The max approach grade of intersecting streets with a through street shall be 3% for 100' per Section 4.05.4 in the roadway manual. [2 comments]
- 11Q. Ensure the landscape plan matches the grading here.
- 11R. Show/label the 100-year WSEL. Show/label the maintenance access to the bottom of the pond and to the top of the outlet structure.
- 11S. Label as private, and add a note indicating who will maintain private storm sewer, typical for all inlets within tracts.
- 11T. Provide a longitudinal slope here.
- 11U. Dimension the path and provide a slope label - max 10%. Maintenance is also required to the top of the outlet structure from outside of the pond.  
[Site Plan Page 15]
- 11V. Is this grading correct?
- 11W. The max approach grade of intersecting streets with a through street shall be 3% for 100' per Section 4.05.4 in the roadway manual.
- 11X. At a street intersection where two streets slope down to the intersection an inlet shall be placed on the through street's uphill point of curb return and on the intersecting street's uphill point of curb return.
- 11Y. Max 4:1 slopes in ROW.  
[Site Plan Page 16]
- 11Z. Revise text cutoff.  
[Site Plan Page 17]
- 11AA. At a street intersection where two streets slope down to the intersection an inlet shall be placed on the through street's uphill point of curb return and on the intersecting street's uphill point of curb return. [2 comments]  
[Site Plan Page 18]
- 11BB. At a street intersection where two streets slope down to the intersection an inlet shall be placed on the through street's uphill point of curb return and on the intersecting street's uphill point of curb return.
- 11CC. Is there a wall proposed here?
- 11DD. Label all proposed easements.  
[Site Plan Page 19]
- 11EE. This grading looks steep for proposed sidewalks.
- 11FF. Max 3:1 slopes.  
[Site Plan Page 20]
- 11GG. The max approach grade of intersecting streets with a through street shall be 3% for 100' per Section 4.05.4 in the roadway manual.
- 11HH. Cross pans are not permitted on roadways with storm sewers.
- 11II. Minimum 2% slope in the pond bottom.



11JJ. If Tract U is not dedicated as a drainage easement in its entirety, a drainage easement should be provided.

11KK. Show/label the 100-year WSEL in the pond.

11LL. Maintenance access is required to the top of the outlet structure from outside of the pond.

[Site Plan Page 21]

11MM. Max 3:1 slopes. The pedestrian railing is required adjacent to 3:1 slopes.

11NN. There is now a hole here.

[Site Plan Page 23]

11OO. Show the location of the maintenance access on this plan.

[Site Plan Page 30]

11PP. Show/label the 100-year WSEL in the pond. Ensure all plantings are above the 100-year WSEL.

[Site Plan Page 40]

11QQ. Provide a luminaire per the draft standards. Please reach out to me if you need a copy of the standards or the approved equipment list.

**12. Traffic Engineering** (Steven Gomez / 303-739-7336 / [segomez@auroragov.org](mailto:segomez@auroragov.org) / Comments in amber)

[Site Plan Throughout]

12A. Label all access types.

12B. Add pedestrian ramps where indicated.

[Site Plan Page 2]

12C. 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.’

[Site Plan Page 4]

12D. Show receiving ped ramp.

12E. Align N-S ped ramps or at a minimum provided edge-to-edge alignment. [2 comments]

12F. Provide sight triangles per COA TE-13.

[Site Plan Page 5]

12G. Show the east leg of Warren Street for reference only.

12H. Adjust the sight triangle for the driver’s continuous view of the center of the opposing lane.

[Site Plan Page 7]

12I. Remove ramps if tee intersection.

12J. Show east leg if planned.

12K. Show truncated domes for all ramps.

12L. Relocate kiosk out of the intersection area.

[Site Plan Page 9]

12M. Remove ramps if tee intersection.

12N. Show east leg if planned.

12O. Show truncated domes for all ramps.

[Site Plan Page 11]

12P. Add a STOP sign.

[Site Plan Page 22]

12Q. Move out of the intersection influence area.

[Site Plan Page 23]

12R. Add sight triangles at all intersections that include public ROW.

12S. Verify mature plant height within sight triangles meets COA 4.04.2.10 requirements.



[Site Plan Page 24]

12T. 50' min spacing between STOP sign and tree, typical.

[Site Plan Page 25]

12U. 50' min spacing between STOP sign and tree, typical.

[Site Plan Page 27]

12V. 50' min spacing between STOP sign and tree, typical.

[Site Plan Page 29]

12W. 50' min spacing between STOP sign and tree, typical.

[Site Plan Page 33]

12X. Split rail fence not allowed within sight triangles.

[TIS Page 1]

12Y. If TIS is for Filing 2 only then update text/tables/graphics and/or add notes to reflect as such. If for Filings 1& 2, then update text/tables/graphics and/or add notes accordingly.

12Z. See comments throughout the report.

[TIS Page 13]

12AA. Does background include Filing 1 traffic?

[TIS Page 16]

12BB. Does background include Filing 1 traffic?

[TIS Page 21]

12CC. Having Filing 1 site traffic makes this table a little confusing since the TIS is for Filing 2.

12DD. Consider removing Filing 1 site traffic and/or add a note that Filing 1 site trips were accounted for in background traffic.

12EE. Clarify/Verify what Total Trips (long term) represent.

[TIS Page 23]

12FF. Short term assignment is for Filing 2 only.

[TIS Page 24]

12GG. Long term assignment is for Filings 1 AND 2.

[TIS Page 26]

12HH. Update traffic volumes based on previous comments, as needed.

12II. ADT seems low relative to peak hour.

[TIS Page 27]

12JJ. Update analysis based on previous comments, as needed.

[TIS Page 29]

12KK. Update traffic volumes based on previous comments, as needed.

12LL. ADT seems low relative to peak hour.

[TIS Page 30]

12MM. Update analysis based on previous comments, as needed.

[TIS Page 31]

12NN. LOS not consistent with delay.

### **13. Fire / Life Safety** (William Polk / 303-739-7371 / [wpolk@auroragov.org](mailto:wpolk@auroragov.org) / Comments in blue)

[Site Plan Page 3]

13A. A phasing plan with a descriptive narrative must be provided with the Planning Departments' site plan and Public Works Departments' civil plan submittal. The phasing plan must illustrate each phase and provide a narrative that describes how the phasing will implement the required two points of access and a looped water supply at all times during the phased construction. **For example, describe where the water connections will be established to form the looped water supply and what streets will be constructed to provide the two approved points of access.** Also, make sure to incorporate COA Water and Public Works phasing requirements into the phasing plan.



[Site Plan Page 13]

13B. See fire hydrant relocation comments.

**14. Aurora Water** (Daniel Pershing / 303-739-7646 / [ddpershi@auroragov.org](mailto:ddpershi@auroragov.org) / Comments in red)

14A. There were no more comments from Aurora Water on this review.

**15. Aurora Water/TAPS** (Diana Porter / [dspoerter@auroragov.org](mailto:dspoerter@auroragov.org))

15A. Storm drain development fees due: 124.054 acres x \$1,242.00 = \$154,075.07

15B. Commercial users with meters one and one-half inches and smaller with landscaped areas not served by a separate irrigation system shall be charged an outdoor fee based upon the total landscaped area.

**16. PROS** (Alex Grimsman / 303-739-7154 / [agrimisma@auroragov.org](mailto:agrimisma@auroragov.org) / Comments in purple)

[Site Plan Page 1]

16A. If you have a deficit in your land dedication and are planning to make it up in PA-9, which is already fully dedicated in the master plan, where will the additional acreage come from?

[Site Plan Page 2]

16B. Add Note:

**'Parks, Recreation & Open Space**

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.

16C. It needs to be noted somewhere what specific tracts are being requested for credit. use an asterisk if being used to meet open space or park requirements.

16D. 'Neighborhood Park'

[Site Plan Page 18]

16E. This grade is excessive for areas being used for land dedication requirements. Please ensure areas being requested for credit are not exceeding 4:1 slope.

16F. Note the cross and longitudinal slope for all trails within the plan set. Trails and sidewalks cannot exceed 2% cross slope or more than 5% longitudinal slope.

[Site Plan Page 29]

16G. Call out the 14' trail on the south side.

[Site Plan Page 30]

16H. Where is the 14' trail?

16I. The Murphy Creek Regional Trail will need to be within a 70' corridor, please coordinate further with PROS staff on the trail continuation on the north or south, PROS preference is on the south, however, additional coordination with developments to the west will be needed as well.

[Site Plan Page 31]

16J. Note the slope of all trails/walks in the park. Since these areas are not included in the grading plan, show them here to ensure they are meeting PROS and ADA standards.

**17. Real Property** (Carlos Pietri / 303-318-6342 / [cpietri@auroragov.org](mailto:cpietri@auroragov.org) / Comments in magenta)

[Plat Page 1]

17A. Send in the State Monument Records for the aliquot corners used in the plat.

17B. Send in the Certificate of Taxes Due. Show they are paid in full up to and through the plat approval date of recording. Obtained from the County Treasurer's office.

17C. Need reception #.

17D. Need a date here.

17E. Send in the copy of the Deed of Trust document showing this Mortgage Holder, this is not shown in the Title Commitment.



[Plat Page 2]

17F. Add recording info.

17G. Are there street names instead of street letters?

**18. Xcel Energy (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / [donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com](mailto:donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com))**

17A. Public Service Company of Colorado's Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk acknowledges the comment responses for Harvest Crossing PA 5 6 7 - Harvest Crossing F3. No additional referrals are necessary.

**19. Mile High Flood District (Derek Clark / 303-455-6277 / [submittals@udfcd.org](mailto:submittals@udfcd.org))**

19A. The comment response letter states that the proposed Harvest Gulch cross-section and the flow rate were approved in the Master Drainage Report by ILC, Inc. and approved in April 2021. It should be noted that the cross-section and flow rate being presented within this report were from the Master Drainage Report for the downstream Murphy Creek East compiled by CVL Consultants and approved on 11/30/2020. This documentation should be included with this report as a reference appendix and text modified as needed.

19B. While this information is sufficient for this submittal, a more detailed geomorphic analysis will need to be included with the final design. The slope is presented in this document is much steeper than the one presented in that report and analysis will need to be completed to determine the impact of that increase. The intent of the channel should be designed to be a high functioning, low maintenance stream per MHFD criteria in order to quality for maintenance eligibility.