

August 21, 2020

City of Aurora
Ryan Loomis
15151 E. Alameda Pkwy
Aurora, CO 80012

Re: **Second Submission Review:** High Point PA-64 Multi-Family – Site Plan and Final Plat
Application Number: DA-1762-22
Case Numbers: 2020-4009-00; 2020-3014-00

Dear Mr. Loomis:

Thank you for taking the time to provide comments on the Second Submission of High Point PA-64 Multi-Family – Site Plan and Final Plat. Our staff has reviewed the comments received on July 1, 2020. We have made the following changes. Please reach out with any questions a scrowder@norris-design.com or 303-892-1166.

Sincerely,
Norris Design

Samantha Crowder
Senior Associate

Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Remove all AutoCAD SHX text from the Site Plan.
- Provide required incentive features along Lisbon Street and 66th Avenue to meet landscape buffer requirements.
- Add a 5-foot sidewalk along the east side of the site to comply with block perimeter standards.
- Provide more architectural variation to differentiate Type I and II buildings.
- Update the street frontage buffer table.
- Show and label easements and roof drains.
- Site plan will not be approved by Public Works until the plans for 66th and 67th Avenue have been submitted and no major issues remain.
- Address Real Property comments.
- Show locations of all accessible living units (Type A or B) and accessible attached garages.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. **Planning Comments** (Ryan Loomis / rloomis@auroragov.org / 303-739-7220 / Comments in teal)

1A. Please make the provided edits to the Letter of Introduction.

Response: Letter of introduction has been revised.

Redlines to Cover Sheet (Sheet 1):

1B. The lot and block number (i.e. Lot 1, Block 1 of High Point Subdivision Filing No. 1) should be included below the title on the cover sheet.

Response: Lot and block information added.

1C. Please remove all AutoCAD SHX text from the Site Plan, which appears was not done in this submittal.

Response: Files will be flattened prior to submitting.

1D. Please make this Amendment Block larger. This may require moving the site plan notes to a new sheet that is located directly after the cover sheet.

Response: The amendments block has been enlarged.

1E. Please clarify whether any signs proposed. If so, sign data information is needed under Project Data. See example on cover sheet. Even if quantities and square footage are unknown, the code requirements should still be noted in the Data Block and "TBD" can be noted for "proposed number of signs" and "proposed square footage of signs."

Response: Sign area has been added to the cover sheet.

Redlines to Site Plan (Sheet 2 and 3):

1F. Please provide a minimum 5-foot north / south sidewalk outside the 25-foot landscape buffer to comply with the block perimeter requirement in the UDO. This was provided in the previous submittal and instead of the sidewalk being shifted to comply with PROS requirements, it was completely removed. This sidewalk should connect from 66th Avenue to 67th Avenue and should include access to the individual units facing the park off of the sidewalk. Because the site has not been platted yet, the simplest way to accommodate this requirement is by

shifting the property line of the park to the east to accommodate the additional space. Alternatively, the buildings along the east side of the site could be shifted west.

Response: Per conversations with staff, a 4' sidewalk adjacent to the eastern most buildings has been provided adjacent to the 25' landscape buffer.

1G. As mentioned in the PROS comment, Planning has concerns about the grading on the east side of the site and how the neighborhood park will be well-integrated with this development.

Response: Per coordination with the City, the grading has been revised to lessen the slope down to the park. During CD's, it is assumed that the park design will be underway, and the grading can be further coordinated.

1H. The High Point at DIA Master Plan shows that a secondary entry monument sign may be placed at the corner of 67th Avenue and Lisbon Street. Please verify if a monument sign is proposed.

Response: A ground-level monument is not proposed at this location.

1I. Please turn the retaining wall to the right where Building 6 ends on Lisbon Street instead of having it end abruptly.

Response: The emergency overflow for the sunken area between the building and Lisbon walls are out this north end. Turning the wall would interfere with this overflow.

1J. Please note that a 15' wide setback and a 20' wide landscape buffer is required along all public and private streets as noted in the pre-application notes. However, these requirements were overlooked during the first review of the application and therefore will not be required for this project. Please be aware though that any future projects will be expected to comply with all setback and buffer requirements, even for private streets, and that this will not set a precedent.

Response: Comment noted. Thank you.

1K. Please continue the retaining wall along the entire building length of Lisbon Street as this is required based on the incentive allowed for a reduced landscape buffer. Also, the wall needs to follow along 66th Avenue to meet the incentive requirement. Please see the Landscape section for additional comments.

Response: The wall has been added to portions extending along Lisbon Street to the south and along 66th Avenue.

Redlines to Landscape Details (Sheet 17)

1L. Please provide a detail of the retaining wall proposed along Lisbon Street and required along 66th Avenue as part of incentives for a reduced landscape buffer. Show height and materials proposed for wall.

Response: A detail of the retaining wall has been added to Sheet 16.

Redlines to Building Elevations (Elevations Sheets 18-21 and Colored Elevations Sheet 1 and 2)

1L. It appears Building Type I and II have identical architecture features, just variation in color. As mentioned in original submittal, the third building elevation can be a modified or varied version of the proposed elevations. Similar colors or materials can be utilized, but it should include variation in the architectural features or placement of colors / materials.

Response: Alternate building elevation has been revised to show variation in architectural features and in color at buildings 1 & 6. Elevations have been noted as to which street they face since the buildings rotate on site adding further variation. See elevation sheets for revisions and reference the perspective

exhibits showing the streetscape views from Lisbon and 66th.

1M. The entry comment from the original submittal has not been sufficiently addressed. Building entries should be clearly articulated to show importance. The main entries on the ground floor currently are still not articulated. Each entry needs to be accentuated by using a method showcased in Section 146-4.8.7.E, Table 4.8-9.

Response: At all building entries, elevations revised to show a 2 ft recess per section 146.4.8.7.E table 4.8-9 option e. with covered entries. Recesses also provide a change in material for further delineation.

Open Space Exhibit

1N. For total open space, only show the landscaped areas and not hardscape sidewalk areas where no landscaping is found. It appears this is the calculation provided for landscaped areas on site plan cover sheet and this should be modified to include only the usable open space calculation as noted below.

Response: Per conversations with Ryan Loomis on 8/19, the calcs have been revised to show the total landscape area as originally shown minus paving areas that aren't adjacent to landscape and minus any small internal parking lot islands

1O. For the consolidated usable open space calculation, which should be 20% of the site area (100,560.75 square feet) please outline in red the areas that you are counting. This should not include curbside landscape areas, sidewalks along public or private streets, landscape islands, etc. However, it can include larger buffer areas or pedestrian trails that connect the consolidated usable open spaces to each other. Please revise this exhibit and coordinate with your Case Manager on which areas can count towards meeting this requirement.

Response: The total open space is shown in green in the exhibit and the total "usable open space" is shown as outlined in red. The exhibit and calculations have been updated to reflect the areas mentioned above.

Plat

1P. Please disregard original comment requesting the signature lines for the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council.

Response: Signature lines removed.

1Q. As suggested on site plan, please shift the east property line further east to accommodate the required 5-foot sidewalk east of buildings and outside the required 25-foot landscape buffer area along proposed park.

Response: Property line has been revised.

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

Site Plan

Redlines to Landscape Cover Sheet (Sheet 11)

2A. Add a landscape building perimeter table for the club house. The requirements are one tree or tree equivalent per 40 lineal feet.

Response: A Clubhouse Perimeter Table has been added to the Landscape Cover Sheet.

2B. For the multi-family buildings, plant counts should meet code or request an adjustment. Remember buffer plant material may count if within 20' of the building face.

Response: All landscape requirements have been completed.

2C. Update the parking median landscaping table to reflect three separate medians.

Response: The Parking Median Landscaping Table has been updated to reflect 3 separate medians.

2D. Make the updates to the remaining tables as noted.

Response: Updates to the tables have been completed as noted.

Redlines to Landscape Plan (Sheet 13)

2E. Dimension and label the street and non-street frontage buffers where indicated.

Response: Buffers have been dimensioned and labeled where indicated.

2F. Turn on the fire hydrants. They appear to be missing.

Response: All fire hydrants have been shown.

2G. Add a street name where indicated.

Response: Street name addressing has been submitted to the City. The street name will be updated prior to final approval.

2H. Add a street tree where shown.

Response: No tree has been added as the location indicated is outside of the property line.

2I. Dimension and label the special landscape buffer; non-street frontage.

Response: Buffers have been dimensioned and labeled where indicated.

2J. Add the hatch to the legend.

Response: The carport area hatches have been added to the Landscape Legend.

2K. Add an additional shrub to the parking lot island where indicated.

Response: An additional shrub has been added to the parking lot island where indicated.

2L. Extend the low wall along the frontage of building 7 to remain in compliance with the buffer reduction of 15'.

Response: A low wall has been added along 66th Avenue to comply with buffer requirements, per email conversation with Kelly Bish dated 08/03/2020.

2M. This KEL shrub can get 3' tall and the maximum height is 26" for sight distance triangles

Response: Kelsey Dogwood within the sight triangles have been updated to

Redlines to Landscape Plan (Sheet 14)

2N. Please note that a 20' wide landscape buffer is typically required along all public and private streets as noted in the pre-application notes. However, given this is in the second review cycle, planning staff is going to overlook this, but will expect to see the required buffer on future land development applications.

Response: Thank you. Noted.

2O. Dimension and label the street frontage and special landscape buffers.

Response: Buffers have been dimensioned and labeled where indicated.

2P. Add the missing hatch to the legend.

Response: The carport area hatches have been added to the Landscape Legend.

2Q. Add additional plant material to the parking lot island as noted.

Response: An additional shrub has been added to the parking lot island where indicated.

2R. Continuation of the low wall should be installed along Lisbon Street in order to meet the buffer reduction of 15'.

Response: A low wall has been added along 66th Avenue to comply with buffer requirements, per email conversation with Kelly Bish dated 08/03/2020.

2S. Add a low wall along 66th Avenue if a buffer reduction is being sought.

Response: A low wall has been added along 66th Avenue to comply with buffer requirements, per email conversation with Kelly Bish dated 08/03/2020.

2T. Provide the missing street name.

Response: Street name addressing has been submitted to the City. The street name will be updated prior to final approval.

2U. Make sure the fire hydrants are all shown.

Response: All fire hydrants have been shown.

2V. Add a street tree where indicated.

Response: No tree has been added as the location indicated is outside of the property line.

3. **Addressing** (Phil Turner / 303-739-7271 / pcturner@auroragov.org)

3A. Please submit a preliminary digital addressing .SHP or a .DWG file as soon as possible. This digital file is used for street naming, addressing and preliminary GIS analysis. Include parcels, street lines and building footprints at a minimum. Please ensure that the digital file is provided in a NAD 83 feet, State plane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please provide a CAD .dwg file that is a 2013 CAD version. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. More information can be found at: <http://tinyurl.com/AuroraCAD> or by contacting CADGIS@auroragov.org

Response: Addressing has been coordinated with Mr. Turner as requested.

4. **Public Works** (Kristin Tanabe / 33-739-7431 / ktanabe@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

4A. The Site Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the Preliminary Drainage Report is approved.

Response: Comment Noted. The 2nd submittal to the City was submitted on 07/02/2020. Comments will be addressed once received.

4B. The Site Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the plans for the adjacent roadways have been submitted, are consistent with this plan set and no major issues remain.

Response: Comment Noted. To our knowledge, the applicant for these adjacent roadways have had a Pre-App and will be moving forward with the City process.

Redlines to Site Plan (Sheets 2 and 3):

4C. A 20-foot lot corner radius is required for shown area.

Response: 20' radii has been provided at the northwest and southwest property corners.

4D. Please clarify why the easements are not being dedicated with the plat?

Response: All proposed easements will be dedicated via the Plat.

4E. Provide dimensions for access and label easement.

Response: The easement has been labeled which provides the access width.

4F. Please note that 66th Avenue is supposed to be a Type 1 Local Road with 64-foot ROW per comments from the pre-application meeting.

Response: The ROW for 66th Ave. has been changed to 64' on all sheets.

Redlines to Preliminary Grading Plan (Sheet 4 and 5):

4G. Please label the longitudinal slope of access.

Response: Longitudinal slopes have been added at both flowlines.

4H. Please show and label easements.

Response: The easements and labels have been added.

4I. Please show and label roof drains.

Response: The roof drains have been shown and labeled.

4J. Please note if slopes away from the buildings are not be shown, add a note indicating the minimum slopes required.

Response: Note #3 has been added that reads "Minimum slope away from the buildings is 5% for 10' for landscape areas and 2% for impervious areas."

4K. The proposed grading for the adjacent streets needs to be shown on this plan to ensure they match.

Response: The proposed grading for the adjacent streets has been shown.

4L. Please note a maximum 4% cross slope in fire lane.

Response: Grades have been revised to have a max cross slope of 4% across all fire lanes.

Redlines to Sheet 2

4M. A 20-foot lot corner radius is required for shown area.

Response: 20' radii has been provided at the northwest and southwest property corners.

4N. Please clarify why the easements are not being dedicated with the plat?

Response: All proposed easements will be dedicated via the Plat.

4O. This radius may change based on the plans for the street. Provide adjacent street information to confirm this radius is appropriate.

Response: The updated adjacent roadway backgrounds are shown.

5. **PROS (Michelle Teller / 303-739-7437 / mteller@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)**

Redlines to Site Plan (Sheet 4)

5A. The grade you're proposing within the 25' buffer on the east side is too significant and will cause adverse effects to the neighborhood park as well as make plant material difficult to establish. Note that all local park

connections also must meet ADA standards, be a minimum of 6' in width, 2% max cross slope and 5% max longitudinal cross slope.

Response: Per coordination with the City, the grading has been revised to lessen the slope down to the park. During CD's, it is assumed that the park design will be underway, and the grading can be further coordinated. The longitudinal grade along the walk out to the park has been revised to 4.8%.

5B. There is a pedestrian crossing planned between your site and the open space to the north. Please coordinate with Traffic and PROS on the design for safe pedestrian crossing as it relates to the roadway built-out.

Response: Comment Noted. A crosswalk and ramp have been shown. Coordination with designers of 67th Avenue will be needed for this pedestrian crossing.

Redline to Landscape Plan (Sheet 13)

5C. Location with grade and visibility will not be safe. Remove and this will be coordinated at future site plan for the park.

Response: This access has been removed.

General Comment

5D. At the time of building permit, a park development fee for the Community Park portion of the development will be collected on a per-unit basis.

Response: Comment noted. Thank you.

6. Real Property (Maurice Brooks / 303-739-7294 / mrbooks@auroragov.org / Comments in pink)

General Comment

6A. See the red line comments on the plat and site plan. Dedicate the new easements, shown on the Site Plan, by separate documents. Contact Andy Niquette (aniquett@auroragov.org) to start the process. There are several objects (steps, fences, etc.) located in the proposed easements that need to be covered by a License Agreement. contact Grace Gray (ggray@auroragov.org) for the License Agreement concerns. Send in the State Monument Records for the aliquot corners used in the plat. Send in the updated Title Commitment for this property.

Response: Dedications by separate document and license agreements are in process. Monument records and title commitment will be provided.

Redlines to Site Plan (Various Sheets)

6B. The private fence in the Utility easement (typ.) will need to be covered for the encroachment

Response: Comment noted, coordination with Xcel is ongoing to try and eliminate this easement in this location. If easement remains, license agreements for the encroachments will be prepared.

6C. The steps in the Utility easement will need to be covered for the encroachment.

Response: Comment noted, coordination with Xcel is ongoing to try and eliminate this easement in this location. If easement remains, license agreements for the encroachments will be prepared.

6D. Please dedicate the 10-foot utility easement.

Response: 10' Utility Easement has been added and will be dedicated via the Plat. Coordination with Xcel is ongoing to try to eliminate portions of this easement where we have wall/steps/tree encroachments.

6E. For areas shown, please add "to be dedicated by separate document".

Response: All proposed easements will be dedicated via the Plat.

6F. Add "Unplatted" for areas shown.

Response: "Unplatted" has been added to the site plan sheets at all the areas requested.

6G. Add a line of delineation between the two types of easements

Response: The easements are drawn separately and there is a dashed line between the two. It is just hard to see graphically.

6H. Add the street names for streets shown.

Response: To the design team's knowledge, formal street names have not been issued as of yet. CAD files have been shared with the addressing department. Once a street name has been issued, the label will be updated on all sheets.

6I. Add: to be dedicated by separate document

Response: All proposed easements will be dedicated via the Plat.

6J. Dedicate the Utility easement by separate document

Response: All proposed easements will be dedicated via the Plat.

6K. Match the name for the easement shown on Sheet 7 with Sheet 3

Response: The label on Sheet 3 has been revised to match all other sheets.

6L. Please note that no portion of the building can encroach into the easement as shown on Sheet 7

Response: The easement has been revised to avoid encroachment of the building.

Plat

Redlines to Cover Sheet

6M. Please make textual changes as shown.

Response: Plat cover has been revised per redlines.

6N. Delete these signature lines.

Response: Deleted

6O. Add the name of the entity as stated in the Title Commitment

Response: Added

Redlines to Sheet 2

6P. Send in the State Monument Record for this Section corner.

Response: Monument records will be submitted.

6Q. Dedicate the 10' Utility easement.

Response: Added.

6R. Update shown note to be within 120 calendar days of the plat approval date.

Response: Title commitment will be updated to within 120 calendar days prior to recordation.

6S. The Lot must have access to the public street R.O.W. before the plat will be approved.

Response: Noted.

7. **Life Safety** (Jeff Goorman / 303-739-7464 / jgoorman@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Site Plan

Redlines to Cover Sheet (Sheet 1):

7A. The Cover Sheet shall include Implementation Plan per HB 03-1221.

Response: The implementation plan/table has been added to the architecture portion of the plan set for quick reference.

7B. See comments on required accessible attached and detached garage spaces.

Response: Accessible garage spaces have been revised.

7C. Provide the LDN value (i.e. 55-60) for Note 16.

Response: Note has been revised.

Redlines to Site Plan (Sheet 2):

7D. Show locations of all accessible living units (Type A or B) and accessible attached garages. TYP. All sheets.

Response: Per discussions with John Van Essen the specific accessible living unit locations will be shown on the Building Department Submittals. See accessible unit implementation plan chart as requested on building elevation sheets. Note that the 4-storied buildings have elevator access. The Type A units are dispersed across multiple floors and buildings. All other units are Type B in the 4 story buildings. The 3-story buildings do not have elevator access so only the ground level units are Type A or

7E. Show locations for accessible detached garages per 2015 IBC 1106.2. One (1) accessible detached garage per every 25 detached garages. Two (2) detached and 6 attached.

Response: See civil site plan for locations. Accessible detached garage spaces provided at garages G1 & G4.

7F. Provide dashed line delineation between the pocket utilities and the fire lane. Fire lane and pocket utility easements are two separate easements. TYP.

Response: The easements are drawn separately and there is a dashed line between the two. It is just hard to see graphically.

Redlines to Site Plan (Sheet 3):

7G. Move accessible parking to this location. Reference 2015 IBC 1106.6. This is 2nd request.

Response: Please note that the accessible space at the clubhouse was moved in direct proximity of the clubhouse entrance as previously requested. The accessible space was covered over by the "light pole" note. The accessible space to the southwest of the pool does not serve the clubhouse but rather

Building 1 and is located adjacent to the nearest accessible building entrance. Both spaces satisfy 2015 IBC 1106.6 by locating the surface spot closest to an accessible building entrance.

Plat

Redlines to Plat (Sheet 2)

7H. Show locations of fire lane easements and pocket utility easements. Plat shall accurately reflect the site plan.

Response: Easements have been added to plat.

7I. The Site Plans list this street as Lisbon St. instead of Liverpool. Verify street name.

Response: Changed to Lisbon Street.

8. **Aurora Water** (Ryan Tigera / 303-326-8867 / rtigera@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

Site Plan

Redlines to Utility Plan Sheet 6

8A. Show the pocket easement for the irrigation meter and remove size. Meter sizes must be provided at the time of civil plans.

Response: The pocket easement has been shown and labeled. The meter size has been removed.

Redlines to Downstream Utility Layout Sheet 8

8B. Note: Utility construction is to be phased if the goal is to pave this site in sections. Utility phasing plan to be shown on civil plans if applicable. Otherwise all public and private utilities will be installed prior to paving.

Response: Note #2 has been added that reads "On-site utility construction will be completed in a single phase. All on-site public and private utilities will be installed prior to paving."

9. **Traffic** (Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / bmedema@auroragov.org / Comments in gold)

9A. Please contact Brianna Medema directly for Traffic Engineering Comments

Response: Comment noted. Responses to TIS redlines are provided within the redlined PDF and will be uploaded directly to Brianna Medema for review.

10. **Xcel Energy** (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

Public Service Company of Colorado's Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has determined **there is a conflict** with the above captioned project in that the plat as shown on Aurora's website is dated March 17, 2020, does not appear to be an updated version, and does not show the requested 10-foot wide utility easement around the perimeter of the development/Lot 1.

Response: 10' Utility Easement has been added and will be dedicated via the Plat. Coordination with Xcel is ongoing to try to eliminate portions of this easement where we have wall/steps/tree encroachments.

11. **Denver International Airport** (Jeannette Hilaire / 303-342-2391 / Jeannette.hilaire@flydenver.com)

Denver International Airport received your referral dated June 10, 2020 for DA-1746-22 High Point PA-64 Multi-Family – Site Plan and Final Plat. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposal and DEN provides the following comments:

- The site is found within/under the navigable airspace associated with DEN, as promulgated and regulated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) under 14 CFR Part 77, Objects Affecting the

Navigable Airspace. Based on Part 77 and the development site location, the proponent is required to file notice with the FAA, via the FAA Form 7460-1 process (Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration), of any structure or temporary construction equipment (e.g., cranes) that penetrate Part 77 surfaces. The FAA website from which the need for the 7460 process can be determined ("Notice Criteria Tool") and/or the filing can be initiated is: <https://oeaaa.faa.gov/oeaaa/external/portal.jsp>.

Response: Comment noted. Thank you.

- The proposed development falls within the DEN 10,000' Critical Space separation criteria for the final build-out of future DEN Runways. The Wildlife Biologists from USDA assigned to DEN assist in implementing DEN's Wildlife Hazard Management Plan and have requested coordination as this project progresses. USDA and DEN will provide assistance with the requirements outlined in the current version of FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33 (see attached). DEN also requests that the landscape plan include maintenance of trees and grasses to reduce attractants for wildlife such as raptor species, blackbirds/starlings, and geese. Fruit-producing trees and shrubs should be avoided. Water quality ponds/detention structures must be designed to meet a 40-hour drain time following a 100-year event.

Response: Comment noted. Thank you.

DEN appreciates the opportunity to review and comment on the HIGH POINT PA-64 MULTI-FAMILY - SITE PLAN AND FINAL PLAT.

12. 27J Schools (Kerri Monti / 303-655-2984 / kmonti@sk27j.net)

A. STUDENT GENERATION

Dwelling Units	Elementary Students	Middle School Students	High School Students	Total
365 MF	16	9	11	36

(Any discrepancy due to rounding)

B. LAND DEDICATION / CASH-IN-LIEU REQUIREMENTS

The land dedication requirement is 0.86 acres or \$34,274. The District requests cash in lieu of land dedication.

Response: Comment noted. Thank you.

C. SCHOOL BOUNDARY AREAS

Students from this proposed development would currently attend:

Second Creek ES – 9950 Laredo Drive, Commerce City

Stuart MS – 15955 E. 101st Way, Commerce City

Prairie View HS – 12909 E. 120th Ave, Henderson

D. CAPITAL FACILITY FEE FOUNDATION

The Capital Facility Fee Foundation is a unique public/private nonprofit organization founded in January 2001 to help fund school expansion or new school construction. This program has been developed in partnership with each of the municipalities in the District, developer and builder representatives, and School District 27J. Funding is provided by builders and developers who have agreed to contribute per residential dwelling unit based on the current fee structure.

The current fees negotiated for this program are as follows: \$843 per single family residential unit and \$481 per multi-family unit.

Response: Comment noted. Thank you.

SCHOOL DISTRICT PLANNING COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The District requests cash in lieu of land dedication in the amount of \$34,274 to be paid to 27J Schools prior to the issuance of building permits.

Response: Comment noted. Thank you.

2. Given the 365 multifamily residential units planned for High Point at DIA PA-64, the tax-deductible capital facility fees are projected to be \$175,565. The District will accept a total payment of \$50,000 prior to the issuance of building permits.

Response: Comment noted. Thank you.

13. Mile High Flood District (David Skudas / 303-455-6277)

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:

- NA

We have the following comments to offer:

We have no comments on this project as it is not eligible for maintenance. The site is not adjacent to a major drainageway or mapped floodplain and does not include any proposed MHFD master plan improvements.

Response: Comment Noted.