

April 10, 2020

City of Aurora
Attn: Liz Fuselier
15151 E. Alameda Pkwy
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: Third Submission Review – Sterling Hills AMH – Site Plan and Plat

Application Number: **DA-1052-24**

Case Number: 2019-4014-00; 2019-3044-00

Dear Ms. Fuselier:

Thank you for reviewing the third submission for Sterling Hills AMH, Site Plan and Plat along with City staff. Valuable feedback was received on March 26, 2020. The responses to comments have been detailed on the following pages. If you have any questions or concerns, please reach out by phone at 303-892-1166 or by email, scrowder@norris-design.com.

We look forward to making this project a success with the City of Aurora.

Sincerely,
Norris Design

Samantha Crowder
Senior Associate

Third Submission Review

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

1A. Please consider providing section view perspectives showing the front yards of the homes for planning commission.

Response: *Noted, thank you. To address front lot design, additional notes have been added to lot typical requirements to ensure that each lot is developed in a unique manner above code. Additional notes have been added to ensure each lot receives at least one of the following; a low wall, earth berm, or natural boulder. On-lot planting notes are provided to ensure that no two consecutive lots are landscaped in an identical manner, and that plant material is varied across lots. Multiple different planting schemes, as they relate to each lot type, are expressed in lot typical.*

1B. Sheet 2: Please add front setback dimension (12') on the alley lot typical.

Response: *The front setbacks of 12-ft have been shown on the alley lots.*

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

2A. See redline comments regarding plant names and modifying planting schedule.

Response: *Redmond Linden revised to Tilia Americana 'Redmond'.*

2B. Notes comment: Remove this reference as it refers to the previous version of the landscape code.

Response: *This reference has been removed.*

2C. Add a note that two different fence types are being proposed. A screening fence and a two rail fence. Complete the note with a short explanation of where the two fences types are proposed since both do not appear on the plan.

Response: *The two fence types have been revised to vary graphically, for added clarity. Annotations are shown on the plan that explain the location of each fence type.*

2D. Use a different fence symbol to separate the two types.

Response: *The two fence types have been revised to vary graphically, for added clarity.*

2E. Please see Landscape Table: These need to be broken down by each side of the street not as one street. The requirement should be met individually for each side of the street. It appears that it is being met, but must be listed individually.

Response: *The curbside landscape table has been revised so that shrub equivalents are broken out per each side of the street.*

2F. Provide a plan that delineates the three lot types on this sheet that is scaled back and without all the plants. These plans are used for inspection purposes. Use three different hatch types.

Response: *Keymap added per correspondence on 3/31/2020.*

2G. Add the LOT WO standards to the right of the title.

Response: *Landscape requirements have been added.*

2H. Because this development is technically not permitted by the GDP/Code and the fact that reduced setbacks are being requested, these lots should have good architecture and front yards that meet code requirements. Include the list of features as noted above and/or one feature for these lot types.

Response: Following correspondence on 3/31/2020, additional notes have been added to Landscape Requirements and On-Lot Planting Notes to ensure that each lot is developed in a unique manner above code. Additional notes have been added to ensure each lot receives at least one of the following; a low wall, earth berm, or natural boulder.

2I. For those lots that do not have a feature such as the following, these requirements should be updated to include one of the following: a low wall, earth berm or natural boulder.

Response: Requirement added.

2J. This is misleading. The plan shows only 8 or 9 actual shrubs. If grasses and perennials are to count, then a note should be added here that three one gallon grasses and shrubs are to account for 1 shrub. Even with that, there are not a total of 15 shrubs.

Response: Graphic quantities represented in plans revised to meet minimum requirements. Note added per correspondence on 3/31/2020 regarding the use of 3 one-gallon perennials accounting for one shrub equivalent, but not accounting for more than 30% of the requirement total.

2K. The two fence symbol line types are too similar. Please thicken one to help distinguish them from one another.

Response: The two fence types have been revised to vary graphically, for added clarity.

3. **Addressing** (Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / pcturner@auroragov.org)

3A. Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for addressing and other GIS mapping purposes. Include the parcel, street line, easement and building footprint layers at a minimum. Please ensure that the digital file provided in a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Please contact me if you need additional information about this digital file.

Response: Addressing is currently being coordinated and will be finalized prior to recording.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

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

4A. The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage report/letter is approved. Please submit same with next submission.

Response: The PDR has been resubmitted to the City.

4B. For retaining wall, please indicate material type, typical.

Response: The retaining walls have been labeled as MSE.

4C. See sheet 4: Flows from the alleys are not permitted to cross the sidewalk. 2-yr flows must be collected, typical all alleys that slope towards the street

Response: The alley driveway connections to the Private Drives have been replaced with curb returns with curb ramps.

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

5A. A License Agreement is needed for the retaining walls in the easement(s).

Response: We have contacted Grace Gray for the retaining wall and other items to be included in the license agreement.

5B. See several redline comments on sheet three.

Response: The access easements within the private drives match the plat language.

5C. Make sure there is a separation distance between the building and any easement.

Response: The inlet has shifted within the alley due to the addition of curb returns. There is approximately a foot between the setback and the easement. There is also a couple of feet within the setback to the building placement.

5D. Begin easement and access license process with Andy Niquette. He may be reached at 303.739.7325.

Response: We have been in contact with Andy Niquette to begin the process.