

July 28, 2023

Debbie Bickmire
City of Aurora
Planning Division
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, CO 80012

RE: Response to Comments
The Aurora Highlands North – Area B – Site Plan – Third Review
Application Number: DA-2062-33
Case Numbers: 2022-4027-00

Dear Debbie:

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Completeness and Clarity of Application

Letter of Introduction

Comment

1A. The request for an adjustment to UDO Section 146-4.3.10.C for double-fronted lots has not been added to the Letter of Introduction. Include the request and justification in the letter as well as on the cover sheet of the Site plan so it can be assessed by the Planning Director.

Response: The following request has been added to the cover sheet and the letter of introduction:

“The Site Plan requests approval of a limited number of double fronted lots on collector and local street (13 or 2.2% of the total 581 lots). This is acceptable given the minimum 70’ landscape tract between the adjacent street and the rear lot line. In addition, the landscape tract has enhanced landscape consisting of a minimum of two trees and twenty shrubs and/or grasses for each 4,000 SF of area, twice that required. A minimum of 25% of the trees will be evergreen species.”

Comment

1B. Verify the lot counts for each planning area and the total number of lots. There are many inconsistencies. 1C. Label PA-32 on the Context Map since it is referenced in the text.

Response: The lot count has been updated.

Comment

1C. Label PA-32 on the Context Map since it is referenced in the text.

Response: PA-32 is labeled on the context map.

Site Plan

Comment

1B Repeat Comment: Each motor court lot shall incorporate a private, usable outdoor space consisting of at least 180 square feet of area and have minimum length and width dimensions of 10 feet. A front yard may be counted toward the private usable outdoor space requirement if the front yard meets the minimum dimensions and the space includes a front porch, deck, or similar space with minimum dimensions of six feet by eight feet. See the landscape comments for additional comments.

Response: A private, usable outdoor space per the requirements have been added in the landscape lot typical.

Comment

1C. County land records indicate that GVR KING LLC is also an underlying landowner. Please add a signature line if this is accurate.

Response: The landowner has been added as requested.

Comment

1D. Add the adjustment request and justification to the Site Plan cover sheet.

Response: The site plan cover sheet has been adjusted as requested.

Comment

1E. The Site Data on the cover sheet states there are 589 lots proposed, however, the sum of the lots on Sheet 6 is 581. Please resolve.

Response: Cover sheet has been updated to 581 lots.

Comment

1F. Revise the Site Data so the sum of areas is equal to the total acreage.

Response: The areas have been updated.

Comment

1G. The loop lane section for Tract J will be acceptable for one-way travel. Revise the Site Plan labels which indicate two-way travel. Add signage for one-way traffic.

Response: Signage for one-way traffic has been added as requested.

Comment

1H. Jamestown Loop, which is spliced between 3 different sheets, is inconsistently referenced as public street, a tract and the proposed street section is for a two-lane collector. All loop lanes must be private. Provide a two-way section for Jamestown Loop.

Response: Jamestown Loop has been updated accordingly as requested.

Comment

1I. Please review the easement dimensions in the lot typicals on Sheet 3. Make sure all easements are labeled and clarify why lot perimeter utility easements have different dimensions.

Response: Some of the dimensions were miss labeled and have been fixed.

Comment

1J. Show, label and dimension all easements in motor court lots.

Response: Additional dimensions have been added.

Comment

1K. Reference all recorded plats on the Context Map.

Response: Additional Filings have been added to the context map.

Comment

1L. Review the lot totals in the Site Data Table and the Product Types table. There are inconsistent lot totals.

Response: Lot totals have been updated.

Comment

1M. Preliminary Plat No. 8 is the only previous site plan to include motor courts. Please move 72 Alternate Loaded lots in Preliminary Plat No.8 to the Motor Court column in the Product Types table on Sheet 6.

Response: Motor Court column for Plat No. 8 has been adjust accordingly as requested.

Comment

1N. PA-32 (Tract K) is labeled as a Neighborhood Park in this submittal but is not included in the open space table on Sheet 6. Additional information and coordination with PROS needed.

Response: Tract K is not Neighborhood Park and has been labeled accordingly for clarity.

Comment

1O. General comment, please increase the tract label font. Use a leader line if necessary.

Response: The tract text size has been increased.

Comment

1P. Show, label and dimension the sidewalks along 48th Avenue.

Response: Sidewalk on the south side of 48th has been dimensioned.

Comment

1Q. Include all symbols in the legend.

Response: The legend has been updated as requested.

Comment

1R. Review proposed streetlights for consistency.

Response: Streetlights have been updated.

Comment

1S. Many comments and edits are not included in these comments. Please address all comments, edits, and notations on the redlines.

Response: The redlines have been reviewed and addressed.

Comment

1T. Flatten the AutoCAD SHX Text.

Response: The PDF has been flattened.

2. Landscaping Issues

Comment

2A. Provide buffer tables for street and non-street buffers. The Street Perimeter Buffer Table has been removed since the last review.

Response: Buffer tables for street and non-street buffers have been included along with the Street Perimeter Buffer Table.

Comment

2B. All tracts should be included in the Tract Landscape Table. Landscape requirements can overlap as long as the greater requirement is met. Buffer landscape can count toward tract landscape; however, it must be located within the buffer area. Tract landscape should be distributed throughout the tract. Please see redlines where adjustment should be made.

Response: All tracts have been included in the Tract Landscape Table.

Comment

2C. All tracts should be clearly labeled on Sheet 59, along with the respective area of each. Ensure all tract boundaries are clearly defined.

Response: All tracts are clearly labeled, and tract boundaries are clearly defined on sheet 59.

Comment

2D. It is unclear how street tree requirements are being calculated. The Standard Right-of-Way Table shows numerous deficiencies, however, spot checks on the plans show requirements are substantially met. Please feel free to schedule a meeting for us to discuss.

Response: Street tree requirements table has been revised to match the plans and show the requirements have been substantially met.

Comment

2E. Clarify in the Landscape Notes whether rock mulch will be used.

Response: Clarification has been added to the notes.

Comment

2F. Add a typical landscape for 60' and greater lots.

Response: A typical landscape for 60' or greater lots has been added.

Comment

2G. Include side lot landscape in the lot typicals. One tree and ten shrubs are required per 40 linear feet of side yard exposed to public view.

Response: Side lot landscape has been included in the lot typical.

Comment

2H. Include variation in the typical lot landscape plans. They should not be identical.

Response: Variation in the typical lot landscape plans has been provided.

Comment

2I. Revise the lot typicals to show utility easements separately from setbacks.

Response: Lot typical have been revised to show utility easements separately from setbacks.

Comment

2J. The proposed landscape for the motor court lots does not provide for the 180 square feet of usable open space per lot. The open space area shall have a minimum width of 10-feet, outside of any sidewalks and include a stable surface material to accommodate outdoor furniture. Landscape should be designed around the open space.

Response: Lot typical for motor courts has been revised to meet the requirements for 180 SF of usable open space per lot.

Comment

2K. Include landscape material within the motor court area.

Response: Landscape material within the motor court area has been included.

Comment

2L. Clarify how buffers are being measured adjacent to 48th Avenue. Buffer should be measured from the back of sidewalk.

Response: Buffers are measured from back of sidewalk. Plans have been revised to meet landscape buffer requirements.

Comment

2M. Show and label the property boundary/right-of-way line and sidewalk for the south side of 48th Avenue.

Response: Property boundary/right-of-way line and sidewalk are now shown and labeled along 48th Avenue.

Comment

2N. Revise the non-street buffer adjacent to PA-30 so there is 1 tree and 10 shrubs, or equivalents, behind the residential lots.

Response: The non-street buffer adjacent to PA-30 has been revised so that there is 1 tree and 10 shrubs behind the residential lots.

Comment

2O. Add notations where adjacent landscape has been designed by another site plan and include the case number.

Response: Notations have been added where landscape has been designed by another site plan and the case number included.

Comment

2P. Show streetlights and hydrants on all sheet.

Response: Streetlights and hydrants are shown on all sheets.

Comment

2Q. Add a note to detention ponds that landscape shall be designed and installed per a future site plan.

Response: Notes have been added to detention ponds that landscape shall be designed and installed

per a future site plan.

Comment

2R. Increase the size of the tract labels and make sure they are visible.

Response: Tract labels size have been increased and are visible.

Comment

2S. Address all comments and notations on the redlines.

Response: All comments and notation on the redlines have been addressed.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

3. Civil Engineering

Comment

3A. Please revise the note on Sheet 8 regarding PA-29 off-site infrastructure improvements to state that 48th Avenue construction needs to be completed, not just designed.

Response: The note has been updated.

Comment

3B. All loop lanes must be private.

Response: All the loop lanes are private as requested.

Comment

3C. Include a two-way loop lane section for Jamestown Loop. Reference Roadway Manual Section 4.04.2.09.1.

Response: A section has been added for Jamestown Loop as requested.

4. Traffic Engineering

Traffic Impact Study (TIS)

Comment

4A. Please check the consistency of the Appendices, particularly the signal warrant reports included. It appears some intersections are missing (specifically 42nd/Reserve, which is shown to be signalized) and it appears there are duplicate reports for nearly all the intersections. 42nd/Reserve, projected to be signalized, appears to have low volumes and may not meet warrants. Please confirm. I compared volumes at 42nd/Reserve to 2nd/Fultondale.

Response:

Regarding the duplicate signal warrants reports, Vistro uses an NCHRP method (Report #716, 2012) to forecast hourly volumes based on each peak hour. We showed different forecasted hourly volumes based on both AM and PM peaks for a better representation that whether or not a signal will be warranted at an intersection.

Regarding the intersection of 42nd/Reserve, per your previous comment(Area A - May 2022) we updated our study based on one of the previous studies that you recommended to us. Namely, The Aurora Highlands CSP#1 . This intersection is signalized in this report and we modified our control type

to be consistent with this study. This intersection is now stop-controlled. Please see the intersection operation report and signal warrant analysis in the latest submittal.

Comment

4B. Provide a version removing the DRAFT watermark and providing CO PE stamp for the analysis, per the TIS guidelines.

Response: The draft watermark is removed.

Comment

4C. The percentages in Note 2 on Sheet 2 appear to reflect the North A note. Per the TIS this note should read: 25% of 48th/Harvest, 100% of 42nd/Reserve Loop.

Response: The note has been updated as requested.

Comment

4D. The response to comments demonstrates that the trail alignment noted on Sheet 14 is shown relative to the future 48th/Harvest pedestrian crossing location, but that is not shown on this plan. For clarity, include linework for the full intersection of 48th/Harvest to verify trail/pedestrian crossing connectivity.

Response: The linework for the intersection has been added as requested.

Comment

4E. The crossing on 47th Avenue (see Sheet 14) and related signage is not included with the North A Site Plan. Either North A or North B will need to include it.

Response: Signage has been added to North B as requested.

Comment

4F. Revise signage per the redline comments. Many of the signs are sized for multi-lane roadway approaches. Review for compliance with the MUTCD Table 2B-1 and update the legend on all sheets.

Response: The size of the signs have been modified.

Comment

4G. Remove signs from light poles. Adjust plans where signs and lights overlap.

Response: All the signs that overlapped lights have been adjusted as requested.

Comment

4H. For clarity, call out striping or provide separate line type for striping; or move labels so there isn't overlapping that obscures relevant information.

Response: The striping has been labeled as requested.

Comment

4I. Label crosswalks.

Response: Crosswalks have been labeled as requested.

5. Fire/Life Safety

Comment

5A. Delineate the fire lane easement within the looped lane (Tract J). Ensure the minimum turning radii are reflected.

Response: The fire lane easement has been shown and dimensioned.

Comment

5B. Include the fire lane and tow-away signs within the sign/stripping package.

Response: The sign locations have been added to the site plan.

Comment

5C. Show and identify the location of the fire lane signs.

Response: The fire lane signs have been added.

Comment

5D. Include a signage and stripping package.

Response: The signage and stripping is shown on the site plan. When the project advances to CDs there will be separate signing and stripping plans for each planning area.

6. Aurora Water

Comment

6A. The Site Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the Preliminary Drainage Report is approved.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment

6B. Per the new Aurora Water specification (April 2023), banked meter pits shall be located within vaults.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment

6C. A license agreement is required for the mail kiosk noted on Sheet 45.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment

6D. The proposed grades for the private pond noted on Sheet 46 imply that the WSEL will not be accommodated by the pond. Please reconcile.

Response: The elevation call out has been corrected.

Comment

6E. Show the 100-year WSEL for all detention ponds.

Response: The WSEL have been added for the detention ponds.

7. PROS

Comment

7A. The Tract Dedication Table on Sheet 6 should only show Neighborhood Park. Community Park and Open Space. Please make a separate note about the neighborhood activity center dedication and remove it from the table.

Response: The Tract Dedication Table has been revised to include only Neighborhood Park, Community Park, and Open Space. A note has been added indicating that the acreage of the Neighborhood Activity Centers is included in the Open Space Dedication.

Comment

7B. Tract K is pond access only. Remove from open space.

Response: Tract K has been removed from open space.

Comment

7C. Tract AA is school buffer, remove from open space.

Response: Tract AA was removed from the table for clarity.

Comment

7D. Tract G in PA-29 can also count as open space as this is a pocket park.

Response: Tract G in PA-29 has been counted as open space.

Comment

7E. Tract Z in PA-35 does not meet pocket park, mini park, or trail corridor requirements, please remove.

Response: Tract Z in PA-35 has been removed from the open space count.

Comment

7F. Label width of Tract H (Sheet 24). It does not appear to be 30' wide. If less than 30' it must be removed from open space credit table.

Response: Tract H is 30' wide and has been labeled so for clarity.

Comment

7G. Tract K (Sheet 32) is not open space or trail corridor, but only access to the pond. Remove from table.

Response: Tract K has been removed from the table as requested.

Comment

7H. Tracts N and R (Sheet 76) are not usable open space providing a recreation, conservation, or education purpose. For this to be credited please add the 'recreation purpose' by adding a 4' crusher fines path which meanders through the middle to create an off-street trail corridor.

Response: A 4' meandering crusher fines path has been added to Tracts N and R for recreation purposes.

Comment

7I. Tracts N and R are being requested for open space, therefore a sound wall would not be allowed and this would need to be revised to the split rail or metal 4' open style fence.

Response: Sound wall adjacent to Tracts N and R has been revised to a split rail style fence.

Comment

7J. Provide a fence detail for Tract Z (Sheet 76).

Response: Fence detail for Tract Z (Sheet 76) has been referenced.

Comment

7K. Tract Z does not provide an open space purpose and does not meet pocket park, mini park, or trail corridor standards. It is just a landscaped area next to the homes. Remove from open space dedication table.

Response: Tract Z has been removed from the open space dedication table.

Comment

7L. Several areas (see Sheet 81) are requested for open space. so, revise the fence style to be the split rail open space style fence.

Response: Fence style has been revised to split rail open space style fence where appropriate.

Sincerely,

MATRIX DESIGN GROUP, INC.



Jeff Killion, PE
Associate Vice President

cc: 21.1229.001