

August 28, 2020

Debbie Bickmire
City of Aurora, Planning Department
15151 E. Alameda Parkway
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: **Fourth Submission Review –**
Application Number:
Case Numbers:

The Aurora Highlands CSP No.2 and Plat
DA-2062-06
2019-4010-00; 2019-3029-00

Dear Debbie Bickmire:

Thank you for taking the time to review our plans for the CSP No. 2 and Plat. We received comments and valuable feedback in your review dated August 4, 2020. Adjustments have been made to reflect some of the key points made. We have reviewed the comments provided and have responded in the following pages.

Please feel free to contact me directly should you have any other comments, questions, and/or special requests for additional information. We look forward to working with you to make this project a success.

Sincerely,
Norris Design



Diana Rael
Principal

Fourth Submittal Review

Summary of Key Comments from All Departments

- Verify site data area (Planning)
- Add a fire lane sign to gates (Life/Safety)
- Complete the easement release(s) and License Agreement (Real Property)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Completeness and Clarity of Application

1A. Add an amendment block to the Preliminary Plat cover sheet.

Response: The amendment block has been added.

1B. The landscape area in the site data is not the same as on the landscape plans. Please revise or provide an explanation as to how the areas are calculated.

Response: The Landscape Area on Sheet 1 is calculated differently than the Shared Landscape Data Table on the landscape sheets, these numbers will not match. The Landscape Area on the cover sheet is calculated off the final plat tract information. The Shared Landscape Data Table on the landscape sheets includes both the Landscape Area and Open Space Areas identified on the cover sheet (from the plat information), as well as any developer sod, shrub beds, crusher fine areas, or cobble areas within the internal right of way. Additionally, it includes the landscape within the remaining Tract L area, platted with CSP-01. A note below the Shared Landscape Data Table helps clarify how this total landscape area was calculated.

2. Landscaping Issues (Debbie Bickmire / 303-739-7261 / dbickmir@auroragov.org / Comments in teal)

2A. Some of the proposed lots are considered large (60'-70' wide). Please add a category to the Typical Lot Landscape requirements for large lots consistent with Article 14, Table 14.2 in the FDP Appendix.

Response: Category has been added to the Typical Lot Landscape Notes to include large lot requirements consistent with Article 14, Table 14.2 in the FDP appendix.

2B. The Shared Landscape Data Table is shown on two sheets. Please remove one.

Response: Shared Landscape Data Table has been removed from the Landscape Cover sheet. It is now only shown on sheet 38.

2C. The use of sod in Tract D is a choice based on the anticipated use of the adjacent residents; but does not qualify as recreational. Please re-assign that area to the manicured turf sod category.

Response: Recreational activities can occur within a greencourt. Tract D is an enhanced greencourt with dimensions including 60'+ wide and a half an acre, it can also qualify as a pocket park. This space will be open to the public in the same manner as any other pocket park serving the neighborhood.

Recreational activities will be abundant in the greencourt because the surrounding homes do not have yards large enough to provide such amenities. Native grass will not provide the kind of surface that will allow residents to actively enjoy the space provided. We believe that this position is also supported by the PROS manual and the UDO:

- **According to the PROS manual Tract D would be classified as a Greenway or Greenbelt: "Trails in greenways facilitate both recreation and transportation within the corridor. Greenbelts are similar to greenways in that they too are linear swaths of connected open space, but their widths are more**

narrow and their lengths are shorter than greenway, and a greenbelt is less likely to be associated with another special feature though often accommodate wildlife/habitat”.

- *Tract D would also be classified as a neighborhood connection: “These trails provide connections to destinations within a neighborhood. They generally serve routes for residents to travel by foot short distances from their homes to local, nearby destinations. Neighborhood connections often coincide with a greenbelt.”*
- *According to COA code, Green Space examples “include greens or commons, squares, plazas, and promenades as described in the Parks and Open space Dedication and Development Criteria Manual. Green Space is intended to meet the need for park/open space land in more compact areas of the city. It is not required to be designated a component of the city’s open space network.”*
- *Tract D would be considered a Green Court in COA code and comply with the definitions supplied: “The continuous frontage of green court dwellings must be separated from other continued frontages of green courts dwellings by a pocket park tract of at least 60 feet in width, or by a street connection.”, “At least 50 percent of the Green Court open space area shall be landscaped and shall be designed to accommodate foot traffic and play areas. Sidewalks should be located to accommodate pedestrian access while maximizing use of the Green Court open space. Trees are allowed in open areas but should be located along the perimeter and typically be canopy tree species to allow usable space under the tree canopy.”.*
- *Additionally, Parks and Open Space areas shall be “integrated into and throughout the development”.*

Based on these definitions in the PROS manual and COA code, the use of sod from a Sports Turf perspective in Tract D as a recreational purpose is justified. A native grass approach would not be a suitable surface as it would be rough, hard to establish (2-4 years), would breakdown to a dirt patch with active use, and as history has shown on many projects, be a common complaint by the residents who front on the Green Court.

By not providing sod in the greencourt, the applicant will potentially not be exhibiting recreational purpose and thereby potentially also not granted for open space credit. Tract D and other similar the circumstances are indeed valuable open spaces that should receive credit.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

3. Fire / Life Safety (William Polk / 303-739-7371 / wpolk@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Preliminary Plat

3A. A fire lane sign indicating which street the fire lane connects to is required for gates. Please add the signs to the sign package.

Response: *Signage details have been added to the overall site/phasing plans.*

4. Real Property (Darren Akrie / 303-739-7331 / dakrie@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

Preliminary Plat

4A. Encroachments into easements must be included in a license agreement. Please contact Grace Gray at ggray@auroragov.org to complete the process.

Response: *This process is in progress.*

4B. Contact Andy Niquette at aniquet@auroragov.org to complete the easement release and/or dedication processes.

Response: *This process is in progress.*

4C. Show the off-site utility easement to be dedicated by separate document.

Response: This easement has been displayed.

4D. Add or revise text as shown on the redlines.

Response: The text has been updated as requested.

Plat

4E. Verify the streets identified in Note 9 on Sheet 2 qualify.

Response: Looked at again and it appears all streets noted have side lots on them therefore they would qualify.

4F. Identify the off-site easements to be dedicated by separate documents.

Response: Addressed

4G. Add Adams County to the site location.

Response: Adams County has been added to the site location on the preliminary plat.

4H. See comments on redlines.

Response: All red lines addressed.

5. Mile High Flood District (Teresa Patterson / 303-455-6277 / tpatterson@udfcd.org)

5A. See the attached comment letter. (Copied below)

This letter is in response to the request for our comments concerning the referenced project. We have reviewed this proposal only as it relates to maintenance eligibility of major drainage features, in this case:

- Impacts to Regional Detention Basin 8570 including the two proposed outfalls into this pond

We have the following comments to offer:

1) On Sheet 11 of the Contextual Site Plan #2, the floodplain is labeled as the floodway. Please revise.

Response: This has been updated. Thank you.

2) There are erosion concerns with the concentrated flow from the temporary swale along the pond embankment. We recommend placing an inlet at the end of the swale and releasing the piped flow into the pond. This comment is for reference only, and we will address this concern on the forthcoming FDR and CD submittals.

Response: Swale grading has been revised so that the swale enters the pond at a lower elevation. A Type M riprap rundown had been sized and placed from the end of the swale to the bottom of the pond. Calculations show this should reduce velocities to less than erosive for the extents of the rundown. This is a temporary condition, and will be removed with development of The Aurora Highlands, Filing No. 3.

6. Xcel Energy (Donna George / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

6A. Xcel has no additional comments.

Response: Comment Acknowledged.