

November 28, 2023

Debbie Bickmire
City of Aurora
Planning Division
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300
Aurora, CO 80012

RE: Response to Comments – Forth Submission Review
The Aurora Highlands North – Area A – Site Plan
Application Number: DA-2062-31
Case Numbers: 2022-4027-00

Dear Debbie:

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Completeness and Clarity of Application

Site Plan

Comment

1A. The maximum building height of any portion of a primary structure shall not exceed 38 feet (Section 146-4.4.3 Building Height). Below describes how building height is measured:

Building Height. For a building, the vertical distance above a reference point is measured to the highest point of the coping of a flat roof or the deck line of a mansard roof or to a point halfway between the eave and the highest point on a pitched or hipped roof.

For a non-building structure, the vertical distance above a reference point is measured to the highest point on the structure. For both buildings and structures, the reference point shall be whichever of the following yields a greater height of building or structure:

1. The elevation of the highest adjoining sidewalk or ground surface within a five-foot distance of the exterior wall of the building when such sidewalk or ground surface is not more than 10 feet above the lowest grade.
2. An elevation 10 feet higher than the lowest grade when the sidewalk or ground surface described in Subsection 1 of this definition is more than 10 feet above the lowest grade.
The height of a stepped or terraced building is the maximum height of any segment of the building.

We understand there is a possibility PA-4 may exceed the maximum 38' building height, however, since building elevations are not required with the Site Plan, we are not dealing with specific dimensions at this time. Section 146-5.4.4.F.1, Table 5.4-1 allows an administrative adjustment for up to 10% of the

building height (an additional 3'10") for development in the MU-A district, therefore, anything in excess of 41'10" may be considered a major adjustment which would require approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

I recommend proceeding with administrative approval of the entire Site Plan and address the building height for PA-4 separately, when and if necessary. It is unknown at this time if any adjustment would even be required. We would like to have the opportunity to work with the applicant and builder when there are specific building dimensions and elevations for consideration.

Response: As noted in previous conversations, PA-4 is intended to be 43-feet to top of the stair tower. We understand from conversations with Debbie Bickmire that this is acceptable and will need a variance written at time of the development of PA-4 by Richmond.

Comment

1B. The Site Plan area increased by approximately 13 acres. Explain why and where it is located.

Response: The legal has been updated, the PA7 has been added.

Comment

1C. The legal description is for 119.186 acres, the site data includes 158.1 acres. The Tracking Chart on Sheet 6 identifies a total of the Planning Areas as 158.1 acres. Why is there a discrepancy? If the Planning Areas include 158.1 acres, please provide an updated legal description.

Response: The legal has been updated, the PA7 has been added.

Comment

1D. A portion of the site is within the Mixed Use-Airport (MU-A) zone district. Please revise the site data and adjacent zone districts on the Site Plan.

Response: Present zoning has been updated.

Comment

1E. Revise the lot typicals on Sheet 3 per the redlines. Label the setbacks and easements separately because they are not the same.

Response: The lot typicals have been revised.

Comment

1F. Previous comment asked for a typical to show how all (wet and dry) utilities will be provided to alley-loaded and green court lots. The response said it was provided. Please clarify where it is located.

Response: The green court services have been added.

Comment

1G. There are more colors in the Lot Tracking Exhibit on Sheet 6 than there are in the legend. Please show all colors in the legend and how each is categorized. Additionally, increase the tract labels. The Key Map on Sheet 62 should be consistent with the map.

Response: Lot Tracking Exhibit on Sheet 6 has been revised to show all colors as requested

Comment

1H. Tract areas are referenced inconsistently throughout the Site Plan and associated tables, the landscape plans and the landscape tables. Review and revise all to be consistent.

Response: Tract areas have been revised.

Comment

1I. Remove the disclaimer note regarding lot and tract adjustments on Sheet 6.

Response: Disclaimer has been removed.

Comment

1J. Review the triggers for the design and completion of 48th Avenue in the phasing plans with Traffic. Improvements are linked to CO's in PA-29 which isn't a part of this Site Plan. Additionally, if a PA is referenced as a trigger, please make sure it is labeled on the Phasing Plan.

Response: Erroneous references to PA-29 have been corrected.

Comment

1K. Repeat comment: Street names, right-of-way width, and classification should be shown on all sheets, including phasing and landscape plans. Labels need to be enlarged and more visible.

Response: Street names, right-of-way widths, and classifications have been added. Hard-to-read labels have been enlarged and moved.

Comment

1L. Remove references to right-of-way from private streets and alleys.

Response: ROW has been removed from the private streets and alleys.

Comment

1M. Fences are in the Site Plan legend but are not shown on the plans.

Response: The fences have been removed from the legend on the site plan sheets.

Comment

1N. Label adjacent Site Plans and include the Case Number. Please let me know if you need any.

Response: The adjacent case numbers have been added.

Comment

1O. Monument signage labels are inconsistent. Please revise the plans and details to be the same. Ensure details are included for all proposed signage.

Response: Signage labels have been updated to all match.

Comment

1P. Repeat comment: Provide detail for entry medians. Show/label any proposed signs and include details.

Response: There are not any monument signs in the medians. Only the standard median keep right sign which is shown on the sign plan sheets.

Comment

1Q. Revise the areas where corner signage is proposed to show the pavement scoring in gray and the proposed signage and wall footprints in black.

Response: Areas have been revised.

Comment

1R. Is there an interim condition for dead-end streets? If so, show and label.

Response: Type III barricades have been shown at the 2 dead-end locations.

Comment

1S. Show and label the E-470 right-of-way and MUE. Use black linework to be visible.

Response: The ROW and MUE have been labeled and the linework color has been changed.

Comment

1T. Previous comment: The Green Court open space area should be designed to accommodate foot traffic and play areas. Sidewalks should be located to accommodate pedestrian access while maximizing the use of the Green Court open space. Please review the sidewalk locations and try to reposition them to create usable play areas. The comment response that the provided lawns are adequate is not acceptable, nor does the centrally located sidewalk create pockets of open space that could be used for gathering or play. Explore and alternative sidewalk layout to open up the centers of the green courts.

Response: Sidewalks have been adjusted to allow for larger usable spaces.

Comment

1U. Revise the guest parking spaces (Sheet 19) to meet the required dimensions for diagonal and parallel parking.

Response: The parking has been revised to meet detail S9.15.

Comment

1V. Show the trail connection from the approved Highland Green Park to Tract F in PA-12. The Site Plan and landscape plans have different alignments.

Response: The trail connection has been revised on the site plan.

Comment

1W. Not all comments are included in this letter. Please address all comments and notations in the redlines.

Response: Redline comments have been addressed.

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

Comment

2A. Tract areas on the site plan sheets, landscape sheets and the Tract Landscape Table do not match. All should be consistent. Additional comments may be forthcoming.

Response: Tract areas have been revised.

Comment

2B. Increase the size of the Key Map on Sheet 62 and include the following:

- Label all tracts and include the area of each. Use a leader line and make sure each is readable.
- Keep color code to identify lot size (width) relative to the landscape requirements and add a color key that corresponds to the requirements on Sheet 64.

Response: Key map has been enlarged and moved to sheet 64.

Comment

2C. Add a sheet Key Map on Sheet 62.

Response: Key map has been added.

Comment

2D. Clarify what/where the Non-Street Frontage Buffers are located. They only reference streets and appear to have the same information as the Street Perimeter Buffer Table.

Response: The non-street buffers have been updated in the table.

Comment

2E. Add Note(s) to identify who is responsible for median and tract landscape.

Response: Notes added.

Comment

2F. Include all symbols and hatches in the Legend. Add labels to all sheets.

Response: All symbols and hatches have been added.

Comment

2G. Add tree equivalents in the notes: 12 5-gal shrubs per 2.5" caliper tree, 10 5-gal shrubs per 2" caliper tree.

Response: Note has been added

Comment

2H. Repeat comment: The typicals for the front yard landscape requirements do not consistently meet the plant quantity requirements. The shrub requirement must be adjusted if the grass is used. Three grasses equal one 5-gal shrub. Additionally, if a corner lot is wider it may require additional plant material.

Response: Typicals have been updated.

Comment

2I. Repeat comment: Each lot landscape typical should be designed differently to represent the diversity requirement.

Response: Lots show different designs.

Comment

2J. Repeat comment: Show where/how the 180 square feet of open space will be provided for the alley loaded small lots. Front-loaded small lots can meet the requirement with the rear lot setback. A front yard may be counted toward this requirement if the front yard meets the minimum length and width dimensions of 10 feet, and the space includes a front porch, deck, or similar space with minimum dimensions of six feet by eight feet.

Response: 180sf open space is shown.

Comment

2K. Add the landscape diversity note: Matching landscape designs shall be no closer than every third lot or directly across the street from each other. Matching shall mean the same layout with 50% or more of the same plant material.

Response: Note added.

Comment

2L. Show utility and setback dimensions separately. The setbacks appear to be the same, but they are different. Verify easement widths. Some lots have more than one easement shown along the same property line with different dimensions.

Response: Easements have been updated.

Comment

2M Revise the lot typical for paired homes adjacent to a collector to move the house footprint out of the 25' buffer.

Response: Lot typical has been revised.

Comment

2N. Additional landscape has been shown on the lots with the wider setback adjacent to the collector. If that is a requirement it needs to be specifically itemized.

Response: Lot typical has been updated.

Comment

2O. Address redlines and edits to all lot typicals on Sheet 64.

Response: Redlines addressed.

Comment

2P. Locate trees outside of utility easements.

Response: Trees have been relocated outside of utility easements.

Comment

2Q. Is it accurate to state, "Open space landscape around the detention pond shall be designed and provided in a future site plan" regarding Pond 8521? If so, please revise the notes or discuss options with staff.

Response: Note has been revised.

Comment

2R. Repeat comment: Include street names, right-of-way width, and classification on all landscape sheets. Labels also need to be larger or bolder to be more easily identified.

Response: Labels have been updated.

Comment

2S. Buffers are not required where alley-loaded lots front the streets. Adjust the labels to remove the buffer label.

Response: Updated

Comment

2T. Make sure all intersections have sight triangles.

Response: All intersections have sight triangles.

Comment

2U. The area in PA-4, adjacent to Alley D has been revised since the last review and doesn't match site plan Sheet 18. Revise to be consistent and provide access through the green court to connect the alley to the private street.

Response: This area has been revised.

Comment

2V. Because tracts are identified by Planning Area, please add PA labels on the landscape sheets for reference.

Response: PA labels added.

Comment

2W. Ensure the ultimate condition, including movements and turn lanes on 48th Avenue, is shown and represented accurately in the next submittal.

Response: The 48th Avenue base file has been updated.

Comment

2X. Clarify if any neighborhood signage is proposed in the entry medians. If so, show and label on the landscape sheets and include a detail.

Response: There is no neighborhood signage in the entry medians.

Comment

2Y. Clarify whether one or two entry monument signs are proposed at the Fultondale/48th Avenue entrance.

Response: One sign proposed at this entrance.

Comment

2Z. There are two different fence types along the east and west sides of Fultondale, just south of 48th Avenue. Please clarify the reason or revise it to match. The fences also require columns since Fultondale is a collector.

Response: Fences have been revised to match and columns added.

Comment

2AA. Label or remove the hatch in the center of Denali on Sheet 67.

Response: Hatch removed.

Comment

2BB. Revise detail references to increase the size.

Response: Updated.

Comment

2CC. Add adjacent Site Plan names and Case Numbers. Most have been provided on the plans. Please ask for any that may have been missed. Add these in all applicable locations.

Response: Adjacent site plans and case numbers have been added.

Comment

2DD. There is a path/trail in Filing 3 that used to tie into the adjacent neighborhood. How will it be redirected? It cannot just dead end.

Response: The landscape and trail connection will be removed and the trail connection relocated to the east side of the cul-de-sac.

Comment

2EE. The buffer along Denali, south of 48th Avenue does not meet the 20' minimum requirement. It also appears the curbside landscape area is overlapping the sidewalk. Per previous discussions, this is not permitted where turn lanes are needed. Please revise or an adjustment will be required.

Response: The addition of turn lanes on Denali affects the buffer width for four of the lots. Would a variance for these four lots be possible?

Comment

2FF. Revise plans on Sheet 81 to remove landscape in the sidewalk. Additionally, add/disperse trees in the buffer so each lot gets some benefit from the buffer.

Response: Landscape removed and trees added.

Comment

2GG. Make sure the following are included on the enlarged plans:

- Tract label and area (square feet)
- Sidewalk dimensions
- Existing and proposed easements
- Street/alley labels
- Full legend with all materials, hatches, and symbols
- Adjacent fencing (to indicate open space fence type)
- Show the enlargement location on the Key Map

Response: All have been included in the enlargements.

Comment

2HH. Show planting bed limits and ground cover materials. Edger is required to separate planting beds from turf/grass areas.

Response: Updated.

Comment

2II. Provide a detail for the proposed seat walls.

Response: Detail has been added.

Comment

2JJ. Label signage and shade structures consistently throughout.

Response: Labels updated.

Fencing**Comment**

2KK. Masonry columns are required in all fences/walls along arterial and collector streets. Please revise the plans to show the columns and add the note included on Sheet 63.

Response: Columns and note have been added.

Comment

2LL. Per a previous comment about fence setbacks on side lot lines, add the note provided on Sheet 63.

Response: Note has been added.

Comment

2MM. Fence linework in the legend needs to be consistent with the scale of the plans. As shown, they don't read the same.

Response: Legend and plans fences have been revised to match.

Comment

2NN. There are several reverse lots noted on the plans. Add the note provided regarding the fence setbacks for adjacent lots based on what type of fence may be installed.

Response: Note added.

Comment

2OO. The fence layer appears to be turned off on Sheets 88-90. Please show the fences, label the streets and street classifications, and tracts.

Response: Fences shown.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**3. Civil Engineering (Kendra Hanagami / 303-739-7295 / khanagam@auroragov.org / Comments in green)****Comment**

3A. Dry utilities need to be fully contained within the dry utility easement. See Sheet 4.

Response: The utility location has been fixed graphically.

Comment

3B. A sidewalk easement is required for paths outside of the right-of-way. Overlaying of a sidewalk easement and utility/gas easement is not permitted.

Response: The overlap has been removed.

Comment

3C. Advisory comment for civil plan review: Minimum 2% for disturbed non-paved areas.

Response: Landscape areas are at 2% minimum.

Comment

3D. Public street lighting must match the pre-approved 2023 public street and pedestrian lighting equipment list.

Response: Equipment list added to sheet 99.

Comment

3E. Advisory comment: Public street lighting must match the pre-approved 2023 public street and pedestrian lighting equipment list.

Response: Equipment list added to sheet 99.

Comment

3F. Advisory comment for this submittal: Future submittals must include a table showing all missing criteria required on site plans for public street lighting per section 2.12.0.1.

Response: The items listed in section 2.12.0.1 are shown on the site plan with the assumption that the pavement is asphalt but that is said to be Type R3 for all calculations.

4. Traffic Engineering (Carl Harline / 303-739-7548 / charline@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

Comment

4A. Show the latest design for 48th Avenue on this Site Plan, or an interim plan for 48th to demonstrate that proposed movements in this Site Plan are constructable at time of occupancy. This site plan shows barricades at full-movement intersections.

Response: The 48th Avenue base has been updated and the barricades have been removed.

Comment

4B. The northside geometry for 48th Ave. looks offset. Please adjust. All Site Plans are required to demonstrate alignment with opposing (north of 48th in this case) access points.

Response: The 48th Avenue base file has been updated and the opposing intersection lines up.

Comment

4C. The plans appear to show a barricade at Fultondale north of 48th Avenue. How are northbound left movements accommodated, if this is interim? We need an updated 48th Avenue ISP to be background on Sheet 20. Doing so obligates this Site Plan to ensure that proper access is provided once this site is permitted to be occupied.

Response: The 48th Avenue base has been updated and the barricades have been removed.

Comment

4D. Remove "potential" and "future" from the signal easements. They will be required with this development.

Response: Note has been revised.

Comment

4E. Review speed limit(s) to determine the taper rate per comments on the redlines. Taper rates are shown for some intersections, but not all. Please be consistent and show all.

Response: Taper rations have been corrected and labels have been revised to be consistent across all sheets.

Comment

4F. Make the village monument signs at the Denali/48th Avenue intersection more visible. Verify the signs are placed outside of the signal easements, and confirm the landscape/hardscape conforms to easement language.

Response: The village monument is outside of the easement, the shading has been revised.

Comment

4G. Show the 48th Ave. striping per the latest ISP submittal. Signage/striping comments are for reference only and will not be comments that will impede approval of this site plan, in as much as those comments do not impact this Site Plan's operations.

Response: The 48th Avenue base file has been updated.

Comment

4H. Revise/provide signage per comments on the redlines.

Response: The signage has been updated.

Comment

4I. Repeat comment: Mail kiosks need to be located no further than 50' from a curb ramp.

Response: All kiosks have been updated to be within 50' of ramps.

Comment

4J. The roundabout redlines are attached to this letter as a separate document and shall be addressed in the final version on the next submittal of this Site Plan.

Response: The roundabout design has been modified.

Comment

4K. Per previous offline correspondence, show the interim roundabout condition (i.e. barricades or straight curblane with no curb returns for the west exit/approach), as agreed upon with the City.

Response: Type III barricade has been shown on the west exit.

Comment

4L. In coordination with The Aurora Highlands, in order to accept the private status of the Duquesne Street in tandem with head-in parking, it was discussed that traffic calming elements should be utilized north and south of the parking section of the roadway. In this case, speed cushions may be a good candidate to reduce speeds. Please coordinate with Traffic prior to the next submittal.

Response: Traffic cushions have been added north and south of the head-in parking limits.

Comment

4M. If Duquesne St. remains private, 47th Place west of Denali Blvd. should also be private as it does not provide connectivity to public infrastructure.

Response: 47th Place between Duquesne and Denali has been revised to be private.

Comment

4N. Locate crossings to align with the trail(s) and add crosswalk markings as noted on the redlines.

Response: Crosswalk markings have been added.

Comment

4O. The kiosk south of 47th Avenue is located "off" the roadway, however, people will be parking inside the intersection of Eaton Park Street to access it. Move the kiosk to minimum 30' (max. 50') upstream of the curb ramp, fronting street.

Response: Kiosk updated.

Comment

4P. Per previous comments, the background layers show barricades and striping at the Main Street/42nd Avenue intersection that will not be in place once the project is complete. Revise the background lays to show the completed project and show signal easements.

Response: The barricades have been turned off again, hope they stay off.

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

Comment

5A. Please update the labels to reflect the 23' fire lane easement.

Response: Labels have been updated and is shown in the legend because of space constraints.

Comment

5B. Update the sign package. A "Signage and Striping" package shall be included for approval with the Site Plan and shall include fire lane and handicapped parking signs, sign details, handicapped parking stall details, and locations for all. The sign package shall include all signs as required by other City of Aurora departments.

Response: Fire lane signage has been formatted to match the site plan for Filing 25.

Comment

5C. Check with Traffic to determine if the "No Parking Signs" noted on the redlines are acceptable.

Response: Signs have been verified.

Comment

5D. Work with Land Development Services to update the Plat to reflect the fire lane easements.

Response: When the PA is plated it will show the fire lane easement.

Comment

5E. Show the accessible parking signs/locations.

Response: The accessible parking signs have been shown.

6. Aurora Water (Steve Dekoskie / 303-739-7490 / sdekoski@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

Comment

6A. Per Section 4.03.3 of the Roadway Manual, at a street intersection where two streets slope down to the intersection, an inlet shall be placed on the through street's uphill point of curb return and on the intersecting street's uphill point of curb return.

Response: At the location of the comment Elk and Eaton are not sloping down into 45th Ave., they are both sloping away from 45th Ave.

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

Comment

7A. General comment: make sure all adjacent parks and open spaces are labeled and connectivity into the next site is referenced.

Response: Labels have been added.

Comment

7B. See comments within the landscape plan.

Response: Redline comments have been addressed.

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

Comment

8A. Check the tract designations. They should be consistent with the proposed plat(s). Easement designations also need to be checked against the Plat.

Response: Tract areas have been revised.

9. DEN Planning + Design (Lisa Nguyen / lisa.nguyen@flydenver.com)

Comment

9A. No additional comments beyond what were provided on 4/21/2023. This development will require an Avigation Easement, an example is attached.

Response: The Avigation Easement was recorded on 12/12/18 with reception number 2018000099141.

Sincerely,

MATRIX DESIGN GROUP, INC.



Jeff Killion, PE
Associate Vice President

cc: 21.1229.001