

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



October 27, 2022

~~Jason Pock~~ **Jerry Richmond**

Richmond American Homes of Colorado Inc.
4350 S Monaco St., Ste 500
Denver, CO 80237-3400

Re: Third Submission Review – Harvest Crossing PA 5, 6, & 7 – ~~Master Plan Amendment~~, Site Plan, & Plat
Application Number: **DA-1786-03**
Case Numbers: **2005-7007-03, 2022-4017-00, 2022-3049-00**

Dear Mr. Pock

Thank you for your third submission, which we started to process on October 10th, 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 issues remain, you will need to make a technical submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission **after** your Planning Commission hearing date of November 9th, 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 Planning Commission date is set for November 9th, 2022. Please remember that all abutter notices and site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the hearing date. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause your hearing decision date to be postponed. It is important that you obtain an updated list of adjacent property owners from the county before the notices are sent out. Take all necessary steps to ensure an accurate list is obtained.

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.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Erik Gates".

Erik Gates
Planner

cc: Allison Hibbs, Plan West.
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\1700-1799\1786-03rev3

APPLICANT RESPONSE TO WRITTEN
COMMENTS PROVIDED BELOW, 3-27-2024:

PLANNING – RED (PLAN WEST)
CIVIL – BLUE (KIMLEY HORN)
SURVEY – PURPLE (AZTEC)
TRAFFIC – GREEN (FHU)



Third Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Add adjustment information to the cover sheet. [Planning]
- The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved. [Civil Engineering]
- There are several corrections relating to the locations of stop signs and the mail kiosk. [Traffic Engineering]
- Storm drain development fees due: 124.054 acres x \$1,242.00 = \$154,075.07. [TAPS]
- Match easement types to plat where identified on the site plan pages. [Real Property]
- See the comment letter provided by Mile High Flood District.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments, and Concerns

1A. There are no community comments on this first review cycle.

RE: Acknowledged

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

[Site Plan Page 1]

2A. Add "with adjustment" to the title.

RE: Completed

2B. You will need to include any and all adjustment requests on this title page. When listing the adjustment, please also list the code section that the adjustment is to. (Section 146-4.3.10.C for double-fronted lots).

RE: Completed

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

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

RE: Acknowledged

4. Streets and Pedestrian Issues

4A. There were no more streets or pedestrian issues in this review.

RE: Acknowledged

5. Parking Issues

5A. There were no Parking comments on this review.

RE: Acknowledged

6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

[Site Plan Page 35]

6A. Label and dimension the fence setback. This should be at least 4 ft. [2 comments]

RE: Completed

[Site Plan Page 36]

6B. Label and dimension the fence setback. This should be at least 4 ft.

RE: Completed

7. Signage Issues

7A. There were no more signage comments on this review.

RE: Acknowledged



8. Landscaping Issues (Tammy Cook / 954-684-0532 / tdcook@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)

[Site Plan Page 28]

8A. Change 6 AR to 5-AR.

RE: Completed

[Site Plan Page 30]

8B. Change 3-TG to 4-TG.

RE: Completed

[Site Plan Page 37]

8C. Please provide the sod hatch and the square footage of the overall sod area to demonstrate that it does not exceed the maximum 33% of the high-use sod area. Per code, only 33% is permitted.

RE: Completed

9. Transportation Planning (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7340 / tworker@auroragov.org / Comments in light blue)

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

RE: Acknowledged

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

10. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7300 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

[Site Plan Page 1]

10A. The site plan will not be approved by public works until the preliminary drainage letter/report is approved.

RE: Acknowledged.

[Site Plan Page 2]

10B. Label as a sidewalk easement.

RE: Acknowledged and corrected.

10C. Ensure Tract F is dedicated as a drainage tract in its entirety on the plat.

RE: Acknowledged, the drainage tracts have been dedicated as such in their entirety on the plat.

10D. Ensure Tract U is dedicated as a drainage tract in its entirety on the plat.

RE: Acknowledged, the drainage tracts have been dedicated as such in their entirety on the plat.

[Site Plan Page 4]

10E. The curbside landscaping should be the standard 8' wide unless the cul de sacs are attached to Local Type 2's. Per section 4.04.2.01.2, the sidewalk may be attached if it is a local type 2 street and less than 250' in length.

RE: / RE: Curbside landscape reduced around cul-de-sac radii to ensure lot width- landscaping has been refined so that trees are not placed where curbside landscape becomes too narrow, however, the total required number of trees has been provided for the entire length.

[Site Plan Page 6]

10F. Is this easement line on the right side?

RE: Yes, the PUEs are intended to be outside of the lot line, when possible, to maximize the spacing within the lot.

[Site Plan Page 11]

10G. Check the location of these dimensions.

RE: Corrected.



[Site Plan Page 14]

10H. Remove all storm sizing from the site plan.

RE: Acknowledged and removed from the Site Plan Sheets.

10I. Are there walls here? Please clarify this grading.

RE: The grading has been revised, there are no walls being proposed in this area.

[Site Plan Page 16]

10J. Label the slope in the swale.

RE: Acknowledged.

10K. Cross pans are not permitted on streets with storm sewers.

RE: Corrected, cross pans are no longer proposed on street with storm sewers running through the intersection per revised Aurora Drainage Criteria.

[Site Plan Page 18]

10L. Show the ROW lines.

RE: The ROW lines have been shown.

[Site Plan Page 40]

10M. Local streets are called SL-1.

RE: Street lights will be provided with CDs

10N. SL-3 for collectors.

RE: Street lights will be provided with CDs

10O. Ensure the light fixture and pole selections meet current standards. There is now a draft list of pre-approved light fixtures available. Please email directly if you need a copy of the list. jbingham@auroragov.org.

RE: Light fixtures depicted are consistent with filing no. 1 and filing no. 2

[Plat Page 1]

10P. Ensure Tracts U and F are dedicated as drainage tracts in their entirety.

RE: Completed

11. Traffic Engineering (Steven Gomez / 303-739-7336 / segomez@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

[Site Plan Page 4]

11A. Callout sight triangle or add to legend.

RE: Acknowledged, sight triangles have been called out on each site plan sheet.

11B. Move STOP sign closer to crosswalk, typical.

RE: Acknowledged and corrected.

11C. Adjust location of all STOP signs to be closer to ped ramps. Adjust sight triangles, typical.

RE: Acknowledged and all sight triangles adjusted accordingly.

11D. Add sight triangles per COA TE-13, typical.

RE: Acknowledged and all sight triangles designed to current Roadway Standards.

[Site Plan Page 7]



11E. Add sign symbol.

RE: Acknowledged and provided.

[Site Plan Page 9]

11F. All-way STOP needs to be warranted. Provide warrant evaluation.

RE: Acknowledged, all-way STOP has been removed.

[Site Plan Page 11]

11G. Add crosswalk and advance crosswalk signs.

RE: Acknowledged and provided.

11H. Show all intersection laneage.

RE: Acknowledged, signing & marking has been shown.

[Site Plan Page 22]

11I. Move the kiosk out of the intersection influence area.

RE: Mail kiosks have been relocated per the standards below

11J. Outside of sight triangles as defined by COA Roadway Manual, standard TE-13

Outside of the influence area (including traffic queues) for a controlled intersection (stop-controlled, signal controlled, or otherwise)

A minimum of 30' away from stop signs (for stop sign visibility)

A maximum of 50' away from curb ramp crossings (curb ramps to be located on both sides of the roadway)

The preferred location for mail kiosks is on side lots or other common areas for a neighborhood, and while meeting the above criteria, to avoid conflicts with mail kiosk traffic and specific homeowner ingress/egress The United States Postal Service (USPS) must be included in the final determination for placement of mail kiosk within your site, what equipment is USPS approved and what is not. Please contact the USPS Growth Coordinator @ 303-853-6994.

RE: Acknowledged and updated. USPS has approved locations per email 3/22/24.

[Site Plan Page 23]

11K. Adjust the location of all STOP signs to be closer to ped ramps. Adjust sight triangles, typical.

RE: Acknowledged and corrected.

11L. Move the STOP sign closer to the ped ramp and adjust sight triangles, typical.

RE: Acknowledged and all sight triangles adjusted accordingly.

[Site Plan Page 33]

11M. Adjust the location of all STOP signs to be closer to ped ramps. Adjust sight triangles, typical.

RE: Acknowledged and corrected.

[Traffic Impact Study]

11N. Add PE stamp and signature. No additional comments.

RE: Acknowledged. These will be provided upon subsequent submittal due to updates between sub. 3 and sub. 4

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

12A. There were no more comments from Fire/Life Safety on this review.

RE: Acknowledged

13. Aurora Water/TAPS (Diana Porter / dsporter@auroragov.org)

13A. Storm drain development fees due: 124.054 acres x \$1,242.00 = \$154,075.07

RE: Acknowledged





14. PROS (Alex Grimsman / 303-739-7154 / agrimisma@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

14A. There were no more comments from PROS on this review.

RE: Acknowledged

15. Real Property (Ian Wood / 720-486-4531 / iwood@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

[Site Plan Throughout]

15A. Match easement types to plat where identified on-site plan pages

RE: The Site Plan and Plat revised to match easement types.

15B. Revise lot lines to be solid, bold lines, and not dashes

RE: Acknowledged and corrected.

15C. Add curve data where identified on the site plan pages

RE: Acknowledged and provided on the Site Plan sheets as well as a Curve Table Sheet.

15D. Revise and include correct block numbers and lot numbers based on the plat

RE: Acknowledged and corrected.

15E. Add dimensions where identified on the site plan pages and make sure they match the plat

RE: Acknowledged and provided.

15F. Add reception information identified on page 1

RE: / RE Reception info will be provided prior to recording

[Plat Page 1]

15G. Need reception #.

RE: Added

15H. Need a date.

RE: Monuments will be set prior to recordation.

[Plat Page 2]

15I. Add recording info.

RE: Added

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

17A. There were no more comments from Xcel Energy on this project.

RE: Acknowledged

17. Mile High Flood District (Derek Clark / 303-455-6277 / submittals@udfcd.org)

17A. In the project and phasing narrative, the response to statement #4 of the Review and Approval Criteria for Site Plan seems to indicate that there are no existing significant features pertaining to ridgelines, swales, or landforms. This does not seem to be a reasonable response since there is an existing ridgeline dividing the Coal Creek and Murphy Creek drainage basins which is mostly being preserved by this project. There also is the existing Harvest Gulch channel remnant which is being improved as part of this project.

RE: Narrative has been revised to reflect existing harvest gulch.

17B. MHFD requires responses to the review comments, please include these responses with any future submittal.

RE: Acknowledged and responses provided

MAINTENANCE ELIGIBILITY PROGRAM (MEP)

MHFD Referral Review Comments

For Internal MHFD Use Only.	
MEP ID:	109252
Submittal ID:	10009806
Partner ID:	1629581
MEP Phase:	Referral

Date: October 25, 2022
To: Erik Gates
Via Aurora Website
RE: MHFD Referral Review Comments

Project Name:	HARVEST CROSSING PA- 5, 6, 7
Location:	Aurora
Drainageway:	Harvest Gulch

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:

- Improvements to Harvest Gulch
- Detention Pond B Outfall and Emergency Spillway

We have the following comments to offer on this submittal:

- 1) In the project and phasing narrative, the response to statement #4 of the Review and Approval Criteria for Site Plan seems to indicate that there are no existing significant features pertaining to ridgelines, swales, or landforms. This does not seem to be a reasonable response since there is an existing ridgeline dividing the Coal Creek and Murphy Creek drainage basins which is mostly being preserved by this project. There also is the existing Harvest Gulch channel remnant which is being improved as part of this project.

RE: / **RE:** Narrative has been revised to accurately reflect gulch.

As a courtesy to this submittal, we also provided the following comments as part of the public works review of this project:

- 2) In the Site Phasing section of the drainage report, please include text stating Harvest Gulch improvements will be completed as part of Phase 2.

RE: RE: Acknowledged, the Site Phasing Section of the Drainage Report has been revised to include the Harvest Gulch improvements being completed as part of Phase 2.

- 3) In the Harvest Gulch section of the drainage report, it would be good to document that the Harvest Gulch improvements intend to meet the requirements of being a high-functioning low maintenance stream design in order to qualify for MHFD maintenance eligibility.

RE: The Harvest Gulch section of the drainage report has been revised to walk through the low-maintenance high-functioning design process and computations.

- 4) Please help us understand why the Harvest Gulch channel improvements show a trapezoidal channel again. The last submittal proposed a more tiered channel approach which follows guidance presented in the MHFD USDCM for a naturalized channel.

RE: The Harvest Gulch channel improvements have been revised to provide a tiered and naturalized channel including bankfull channel, floodplain terrace and high-flow channel, please see the revised Harvest Gulch channel improvement computations.

- 5) Please help us understand how the future imperviousness values have changed from the approved MDR for the drainage basins to the east of the proposed development. The Alora development to the east is proposing residential with an anticipated impervious percentage of 45%.

RE: RE: The imperviousness values have been revised in accordance with the new Nov. 2023 City of Aurora Drainage Criteria and the new imperviousness values for land uses are largely responsible for the differing values between the PDR and MDR.

- 6) If the upstream offsite drainage basins are being routed to the proposed pond, it must be sized for future imperviousness. Is there capacity for this in the pond? Why did the concept change from the approved MDR? In the MDR, the off-site basin to the east was discharged directly to the proposed channel.

RE: In the interim condition, there are some upstream offsite drainage basins that are routed to the pond through the proposed Kewaunee inlets. Coordination is ongoing with the new property owner to ensure that the offsite drainage basins are delineated and treated appropriately. The large offsite basin to the south of the Harvest Gulch channel has been routed directly into the proposed channel.

- 7) As noted in the MDR, when sizing regional infrastructure such as Harvest Gulch, it must be sized for the future developed and un-detained flow rate. Regional hydrology does not include local infrastructure such as detention ponds with tributary areas under 130 acres. We understand that there may have been some existing decisions made with MHFD prior to Morgan Lynch leaving the Sand Creek Watershed. We feel as if this may be a crucial time to meet with all project stakeholders to further discuss the Harvest Gulch improvements. We would like to request a meeting with the consultant, City of Aurora staff, and MHFD staff.

RE: If this meeting request still pertains to the Site, it will be coordinated and conducted prior to the next submittal of the PDR & PDP.

MHFD requires responses to the review comments, please include these responses with any future submittal.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,



Derek Clark, PE
Project Manager
Mile High Flood District