

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



October 5, 2022

Randy Bauer  
Clayton Properties Group II / Oakwood Homes  
4908 Tower Road  
Denver, Colorado 80249

**Re: Third Submission Review – Kings Point North East – Site Plan (ISP)**  
Application Number: **DA-1609-21**  
Case Numbers: **2021-6059-00**

Dear Randy Bauer:

Thank you for your third submission, which we started to process on September 14<sup>th</sup>, 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 October 17<sup>th</sup>, 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 administrative decision date is tentatively set for November 16<sup>th</sup>, 2022. As the administrative decision date approaches, remember to coordinate with your case manager regarding the notice of pending administrative decision and administrative decision hearing signs. The notice of pending administrative decision is required to be sent to abutting property owners at least 10 days prior to the decision date and the signs are required to be posted on-site a minimum of 10 days prior to the decision date.

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 I  
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Layla Rosales, Terracina Design  
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison  
Cesarina Dancy, ODA  
Filed: K:\\$DA\1600-1699\1609-21rev3



## *Third Submission Review*

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

- Each side of the street is required to meet the curbside landscape requirements if applicable. Each side of the street is independent of one another. It is not a cumulative total. No more than 40% of the total required shrub count can be ornamental grasses. [Landscaping]
- The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved. [Civil Engineering]
- Maintenance access for all ponds needs to extend to a road that will be constructed with this plan. [Civil Engineering]
- All intersections: Several mature plant heights within sight triangles exceed COA 4.04.2.10 height requirements. Verify mature plant heights meet COA 4.04.2.10 height requirements within sight triangles. [Traffic Engineering]
- Will this project be phased? If so, a phasing plan must be provided with the Planning Departments' site plan and Public Works Departments' civil plan submittals. [Fire/Life Safety]
- More identification is needed on private vs public utilities. Maintenance responsibility needs to be identified in various locations as well. [Aurora Water]
- Need to reduce the number of removals in the Tree Protection Plan on both filing #1 and #2. [Forestry]
- Any easements that are going to be owned by the City should be dedicated by plat. [Real Property]

### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

#### **1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns (Comments in teal)**

1A. There were no community comments on this review cycle.

#### **2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application (Comments in teal)**

2A. There were no more completeness or clarity issues identified on this review.

#### **3. Zoning and Land Use Comments (Comments in teal)**

3A. There were no zoning or land use comments on this review.

#### **4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues (Comments in teal)**

4A. No streets or pedestrian issues were identified in this review.

#### **5. Parking Issues (Comments in teal)**

5A. There are no comments related to parking in this review cycle.

#### **6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues (Comments in teal)**

6A. There were no architectural or urban design issues identified on this review.

#### **7. Signage Issues (Comments in teal)**

7A. There were no signage issues identified on this review.

#### **8. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / [kbish@auroragov.org](mailto:kbish@auroragov.org) / Comments in bright teal)**

[ISP Page 1]

8A. While the landscape plans may have been uploaded independently of the site plan, they are in fact part of the site plan submittal and should be included in the Sheet List Table.

[Landscape Plan Page 1]

8B. Please note. Each side of the street is required to meet the curbside landscape requirements if applicable. Each side of the street is independent of one another. It is not a cumulative total. No more than 40% of the total required shrub count can be ornamental grasses.



- 8C. Any curbside landscapes less than 10' in width are required to meet the 1 shrub per 40sf.
- 8D. Only 42, not 55 shrubs are being provided with the combination of grasses. All grasses MUST be 5 gallon in the curbside landscape.
- 8E. Only 21, not 47 shrubs are being provided with the combination of grasses. All grasses MUST be 5 gallon in the curbside landscape.
- 8F. Edit: 12
- 8G. Edit: 25 [2 comments]
- 8H. The shrub requirement is applicable if the curbside landscapes are less than 10' in width.
- 8I. All ornamental grasses should be 5 gallon.
- 8J. The actual landscape plan for the detention pond has not been included in this plan set.
- 8K. Coordinate the sheet numbering with the numbering of the overall Site Plan submittal set.
- 8L. Edit: 9
- 8M. Edit: 74
- 8N. Is it A4 or A2? The map on Sheet LN.2 labels this as A2.  
[Landscape Plan Page 2]
- 8O. There is no sheet LP.24.
- 8P. LP. 24.  
[Landscape Plan Page 3]
- 8Q. These appear to be future water lines. Make them less dark.
- 8R. Adjust the location of landscaping since it is overlapping with the trail.  
[Landscape Plan Page 9]
- 8S. Either this viewpoint or the one on Sheet LP.22 needs adjusted as there is a portion of the trail and contours that are missing.
- 8T. Edit: 22  
[Landscape Plan Page 15]
- 8U. Where is this on the Keymap?  
[Landscape Plan Page 16]
- 8V. Another ornamental could go here. The adjoining curbside landscape to the northwest is devoid of trees due to encumbrances.
- 8W. These three trees should be deciduous. Keep the ornamentals focused on the intersection/roundabout area.  
[Landscape Plan Page 17]
- 8X. What is the ground plane treatment here? Both sides of the street?? Areas less than 10' in width can not be sod. Refer to Section 146-4.7.5.C. [2 comments]
- 8Y. Matchline information is missing.  
[Landscape Plan Page 18]
- 8Z. Matchline information is missing.
- 8AA. This first tree can be shifted closer to the light. It doesn't need that large of a gap.
- 8BB. Adjust the tree spacing on these and the missing tree can be accommodated.  
[Landscape Plan Page 19]
- 8CC. Adjust the location of the trees and add an additional one. Update the table as well. The additional tree will make this site compliant.  
[Landscape Plan Page 20]
- 8DD. Update the Key Map.
- 8EE. Darken the maintenance path.  
[Landscape Plan Page 21]
- 8FF. Update the Key Map.
- 8GG. This does not seem like an ideal condition if and when future maintenance/repairs are in order for either the trail or the utility. Either the utility or the trail should be realigned.
- 8HH. Darken the maintenance path.



[Landscape Plan Page 22]

8II. Update the Key Map.

8JJ. Darken the maintenance path.

8KK. The contours for ALL the ponds need to be darkened on all the sheets.

[Landscape Plan Page 23]

8LL. Update the Key Map.

8MM. Darken the maintenance path.

8NN. The contours for ALL the ponds need to be darkened on all the sheets.

8OO. Include the contour labels.

[Landscape Plan Page 24]

8PP. Adjust location of vegetation off the maintenance path.

8QQ. Adjust label.

8RR. Darken the maintenance path.

8SS. Include the contour labels.

8TT. The contours for ALL the ponds need to be darkened on all the sheets.

8UU. Either adjust this viewport or the one on Sheet LP.7 as there is trail and landscaping missing.

[Landscape Plan Page 25]

8VV. Darken the font.

8WW. Adjust location of vegetation.

8XX. Darken the maintenance path.

8YY. Include the contour labels.

8ZZ. Enlarge and darken.

8AAA. The contours for ALL the ponds need to be darkened on all the sheets.

8BBB. No matchline. Vegetation is cut off.

## **9. Planning Transportation** (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7340 / [tworker@auroragov.org](mailto:tworker@auroragov.org))

9A. There were no comments from Planning Transportation on this review cycle.

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

### **10. Civil Engineering** (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / [KTanabe@auroragov.org](mailto:KTanabe@auroragov.org) / Comments in green)

[ISP Page 1]

10A. The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved. Comments were provided on July 15, 2022, and no subsequent submittal has been made.

[ISP Page 4]

10B. As this pond will be constructed with this ISP, the maintenance access needs to extend to a road that will be constructed with this plan.

[ISP Page 17]

10C. Per Table 4.05.1.1 of the Roadway Manual, the maximum slope for local streets and collectors is 5%. The max slope in the approved civil plans for Kings Point Drive was 5%. Additionally, since this is a new plan set, the variance needs to go through the current City Engineer and will be discussed at the next staff meeting. Typical.

[ISP Page 22]

10D. Show/label maintenance access.

[ISP Page 24]

10E. As this pond will be constructed with this ISP, the maintenance access needs to extend to a road that will be constructed with this plan.

[ISP Page 26]

10F. As this pond will be constructed with this ISP, the maintenance access needs to extend to a road that will be constructed with this plan.



[ISP Page 30]

- 10G. As this pond will be constructed with this ISP, the maintenance access needs to extend to a road that will be constructed with this plan.

[ISP Page 31]

- 10H. As this pond will be constructed with this ISP, the maintenance access needs to extend to a road that will be constructed with this plan.

**11. Traffic Engineering** (Steven Gomez / 303-739-7300 / [segomez@auroragov.org](mailto:segomez@auroragov.org) / Comments in amber)

[ISP Page 27]

- 11A. A more detailed review will be provided on the signing/stripping sheets as part of the Civil Plan submittal. Roundabout approach signing needs to be shown.

- 11B. Label: 8"

[ISP Page 28]

- 11C. Show side street and callouts.  
11D. Verify all match line callouts, typical.  
11E. Add ped ramp.  
11F. Callout striping. [10 comments]  
11G. Add 8. [7 comments]  
11H. Expand sections to show all signs and callouts.  
11I. Remove striping through intersection. [2 comments]  
11J. Show callout.  
11K. Remove all erroneous lines, typical.  
11L. Move sign face to face approaching traffic.

[Landscape Plan Page 3]

- 11M. All intersections: Several mature plant heights within sight triangles exceed COA 4.04.2.10 height requirements. Verify mature plant heights meet COA 4.04.2.10 height requirements within sight triangles, typical.

[Landscape Plan Page 6]

- 11N. Previous comment not addressed: Not in plant code legend. Verify mature plant heights meet COA 4.04.2.10 height requirements within sight triangles, typ.

[Landscape Plan Page 10]

- 11O. Replace plant since mature plant height exceeds COA 4.04.2.10 requirements within sight triangles.

[Landscape Plan Page 12]

- 11P. Add roundabout sight triangles.  
11Q. Move sight triangle to in front of STOP sign.  
11R. Replace plant since mature plant height exceeds COA 4.04.2.10 requirements within sight triangles.  
11S. Sight triangle easement required.

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

[ISP Page 4]

- 12A. Will this project be phased? If so, a phasing plan must be provided with the Planning Departments' site plan and Public Works Departments' civil plan submittals. 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. Also, make sure to incorporate COA Water and Public Works phasing requirements into the phasing plan.  
12B. If phased, to ensure the timely implementation and a better understanding of the points of access and looped water supply during each phase, provide a brief narrative that identifies access and water line extensions that are needed for each phase to include adjacent filings.

**13. Aurora Water** (Nina Khanzadeh / 303-883-2060 / [nkhanzad@auroragov.org](mailto:nkhanzad@auroragov.org) / Comments in red)

[ISP Page 5]

- 13A. Include that approved MUS to supersede this page if necessary.



[ISP Page 7]

- 13B. Why the future? Should this be a current easement? An easement won't be needed for these main extensions when ROW is built. Confirm with Real Property Division on these "future easements" -typical all sheets.
- 13C. Valves on hydrant lateral are to be 6" per Aurora Water standards-make adjustments- typical all pages. This requirement was conveyed via email to Core and EMK on 5/2/22.
- 13D. Label as private.
- 13E. Label as private and remove easements. [2 comments]
- 13F. If this pipe will be collecting private flows (not ROW) needs to label as private- typical.
- 13G. Need to clearly indicate who will maintain this inlet, as it seems to be a crossover into E-470 maintenance areas.
- 13H. Check on this.
- 13I. This inlet isn't collecting ROW flows, therefore considered as "private". Any commingled flows, causes the storm lines to become private.
- 13J. See the previous comment on the "Future" utility easement.
- 13K. See the hydrant comment above.
- 13L. See the comment above and apply to all storm pipe that end with plugs.
- 13M. Note that per Drainage Manual, only type R inlets will be maintained by COA.

[ISP Page 8]

- 13N. Refer to previous comments regarding hydrants- apply to all.
- 13O. See previous comments on "Future" utility easement-typical all.
- 13P. Would prefer to have a sampling station in the park via hydrant in PA-24A.

[ISP Page 9]

- 13Q. Indicate who maintains Antelope Creek.
- 13R. Call out as private.
- 13S. Ensure that all proposed water mains are 5 ft from the edge of concrete- typical all sheets.
- 13T. Call out all private pipes, as private.
- 13U. See the previous comment in regard to valve sizing.
- 13V. The private pipe doesn't need easement.
- 13W. Ensure no valves encroach into the curb and gutter- typical for all sheets.
- 13X. List this pipe as private.
- 13Y. Wrong location?
- 13Z. Identify who owns this line.
- 13AA. Who owns and maintains it? Indicate.

[ISP Page 10]

- 13BB. Per section 24 of Aurora Water standards, COA will not maintain underdrains - include as a general note.
- 13CC. Adjust.
- 13DD. No hydrants in the curb and gutter.
- 13EE. Who owns and maintains this? Indicate for all existing lines that will be used for connections- typical all sheets.
- 13FF. Please revisit if a 6' MH will suffice. Can also use CDOT MH per Aurora Water standards, section 5.

[ISP Page 11]

- 13GG. Need a minimum of 26' for parallel utilities per section 5 of Aurora Water standards- typical all pages.

[ISP Page 12]

- 13HH. Text Covered.
- 13II. General Note for Engineering: If pipe penetrations are to be in corners, pre-cast inlets will not be permitted - typical.
- 13JJ. Please revisit this configuration. Appears that it can be difficult in connecting these storm pipes via acute angles.

[ISP Page 13]

- 13KK. Label Private.
- 13LL. See previous comments.
- 13MM. Plug?
- 13NN. Storm not conveying only ROW flows to be private, please label as private and remove easements.
- 13OO. Will this be collecting private or ROW flows? Please clarify.





[ISP Page 14]

13PP. Ensure all drainage easements extend a min of 20 ft from the edge of the pond. Drainage easements to include all rip rap- typical all pages.

13QQ. Label as private.

[ISP Page 15]

13RR. Clarify this.

13SS. Underdrains will not be maintained by COA- please include as a note on all pages.

13TT. Per Aurora Water standards- pipe penetrations cannot be in the corners of any pre-cast inlets per section 10 standards- typical for all pages.

13UU. Why does private storm need easement?

[ISP Page 16]

13VV. Why does private storm need easement? -typical all pages.

**14. Forestry (Rebecca Lamphear / 303-739-7177 / [rlamphea@auroragov.org](mailto:rlamphea@auroragov.org) / Comments in purple)**

[Tree Protection Plan Page 1]

14A. You will have to reduce the amount of removals on both filing #1 and #2. At this point in time there are many trees that are too large to be spaded. I would say a 12" Ponderosa Pine tree is probably the largest that can be successfully transplanted based on the size of tree spades available in Colorado.

14B. Tree protection overall site data for both Filing 1 & 2, At this point in time the project does not have 70% Ponderosa pine preservation. Several of the trees identified as spaded are too large.

[Tree Protection Plan Page 2]

14C. See notes regarding trees too large to spade. There are also a couple trees that are multi-stem (4455 A&B, 4466 A&B), identified as only one stem will be removed. This typically results in the other tree failing also not sure why only one stem requires removal. Is their grading in the vicinity? If so, both would require removal.

14D. Tree 4446 is located in the middle of a lot of grading, I'm not sure this tree would survive.

[Tree Protection Plan Page 7]

14E. See notes regarding trees too large to spade.

**15. PROS (Curtis Bish / 303-739-7131 / [cbish@auroragov.org](mailto:cbish@auroragov.org) / Comments in mauve)**

[Landscape Plan Page 21]

15A. Either the sanitary sewer and manhole or the trail need to be shifted to eliminate the manhole being located within the trail.

**16. Real Property (Kalan Falbo / 720-338-7419 / [kfalbo@auroragov.org](mailto:kfalbo@auroragov.org) / Comments in magenta)**

[ISP Throughout]

16A. See full comments throughout.

16B. Label all easements. Width, & who is the owner if other than the city?

16C. Any easements that are going to be owned by the city should be dedicated by plat.

16D. Easements dedicated by separate instruments should work with [dedicationproperty@auroragov.org](mailto:dedicationproperty@auroragov.org).

**17. Arapahoe County Public Works & Development (Sarah White / 720-874-6500 / [swhite@arapahoegov.com](mailto:swhite@arapahoegov.com))**

17A. There were no comments received from Arapahoe County on this review.

**18. E-470 Public Highway Authority (Chuck Weiss / 303-537-3420 / [cweiss@E-470.com](mailto:cweiss@E-470.com))**

18A. There were no comments received from E-470 on this review.

**19. Mile High Flood District (Laura Hinds / 303-455-6277 / [submittals@udfed.org](mailto:submittals@udfed.org))**

19A. MHFD staff have no objections to the referenced project at the present time. We appreciate the opportunity to review this application and look forward to working with you as the drainage design progresses.