

April 10, 2023

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

RE: Response to Comments
The Aurora Highlands North – Area B – Site Plan
Application Number: DA-2062-33
Case Numbers: 2022-4027-00

Dear Debbie:

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Zoning and Land Use Comments

Comment

1A. Add a request for an adjustment to UDO Section 146-4.3.10.C for double-fronted lots on the cover sheet and in the Letter of Introduction. Provide a justification and discuss measures taken to mitigate the adjustment. The Planning Director will determine if it will be considered a major adjustment.

Response: The following request has been added to the cover sheet and the letter of introduction.

“The Site Plan requests approval of a limited number of double fronted lots on collector and local streets (13 or 2.2% of the total 585 lots). This is acceptable given the minimum 70’ landscape tract between the adjacent street and the rear lot line. In addition, the landscape tract has enhanced landscape consisting of two trees and 20 shrubs and/or grasses for each 4,000 SF of area, twice that required. A minimum of 25% of the trees will be evergreen species.”

Comment

1B. Each motor court lot shall incorporate a private, usable outdoor space or spaces with direct access to the dwelling unit on the lot. A front yard may be counted toward the private usable outdoor space requirement if the front yard meets the minimum dimensions and contains at least 180 square feet of area and have 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: The motor court lots have been increased by 5' in width to provide additional useable outdoor space. The floor plans have been modified to provide direct access from the home to the outdoor open space. The motor court lot typicals have been modified to illustrate the useable outdoor space provided.

2. Completeness and Clarity of Application**Comment**

2A. Revise the Letter of Introduction to address the previous comments regarding a diagram to illustrate the locations of Planning Areas, include more directional references (N/S, E/W), and address redline comments.

Response: The LOI has been updated and a map has been included.

Comment

2B. To justify the proposed adjustment request referenced above, include an analysis of the total number of lots adjacent to the Reserve Loop relative to the number of lots that are double-fronted.

Response: There are 58 lots along the Reserve Loop within the existing platted areas and the proposed Area B. Of those 12 are considered double fronted with an enhanced landscape tract between the ROW and the rear lot lines. This equates to 21%. In addition, there are 22 lots facing Reserve Loop with the remainder siding to ROW with a minimum 20' landscape tract.

Comment

2C. Label all easements in the loop lane section. Revise to comply with Roadway Manual standards.

Response: The loop lane typical section has been revised.

Comment

2D. Provide separate lot typical diagrams for standard and small single-family detached residential lots. Provide separate typicals for motor court lots to identify easements and utility services; another for setbacks and building separation. Where motor court lots are double-fronted, homes must face the adjacent street. This may result in two different setback diagrams.

Response: The lot diagrams have been modified to illustrate for all lot types. Motor court lot typicals have been added to illustrate setback, easements and utility services as well as useable outdoor open space. Those motor court lots that front an adjacent street illustrate the necessary front setback.

Comment

2E. Lot classifications on Sheet 5 are to identify housing types per Table 4.2-8 to demonstrate the required product mix per Table 4.2-7. Lots should be classified by their individual lot frontage width (not the width at the front setback). Add a category for lots 70' wide and greater.

Response: This issue was discussed with Planning and for the purposes of calculating the total number

of small lots those lots that are on the outside of curves and/or culs de sac the width will be determined by the lot width at the front setback subject to a minimum 35' lot width at the ROW. This more accurately represents the proposed housing type that will be built on the lot (and the appropriate side yard setback) that will be consistent with the homes on either side.

Comment

2F. Replace the font indicated on the cover sheet. The font was not readable; therefore, all lot dimensions could not be verified. Additional comments may be forthcoming in the next review.

Response: The font has been captured in the PDF publishing.

Comment

2G. Revise Site Data Block on the cover sheet to remove the required parking spaces and the number of stories.

Response: The data block has been revised.

Comment

2H. Move the Context Map to follow Sheet 5. Please include land use designation for the future uses (i.e., Park, open space, future school, CAC) per the Master Plan. Identify/label proposed streets.

Response: Sheet 12 has been moved to be sheet 6.

Comment

2I. Label all existing and proposed easements. They need to be shown for reference on the site plan and can be dedicated per the plat later.

Response: The easements have had more labels added.

Comment

2J. Show the proposed lanes and sidewalks for 48th Avenue.

Response: Proposed lanes and sidewalks for 48th avenue have been included.

Comment

2K. Label all tracts and include the area. Make sure labels are all visible.

Response: Tract areas have been included.

Comment

2L. Clarify the difference between street vs. pedestrian lights. Are referenced fixture heights, correct? Ensure fixtures are consistent with previous site plans and the Master Plan.

Response: The legend has been corrected.

Comment

2M. Clarify whether a new metal fence type is proposed. Provide a detail or remove "screen" references.

Response: A new metal fence has not been proposed. The word 'screen' has been removed from the label.

Comment

2N. Make sure lots are labeled on all sheets and lot area is provided.

Response: Additional labels have been added and the lot area has been provided.

Comment

2O. Review how setbacks will be applied to “sideways” lots at the end of cul-de-sacs as noted on the redlines.

Response: The front setback has been extended north on both sides of the common lot line to illustrate an enlarged front setback.

Comment

2P. Revise plans to eliminate overwrites and cut-off labels.

Response: Overlaps have been corrected.

Comment

2Q. Address all redline comments, edits, and notations.

Response: Acknowledged.

3. Landscaping Issues

Comment

3A. This Site Plan was submitted prior to the effective date of the new ordinance, however, be advised, site plans going forward will not be permitted to have turf in front yards or in the tree "lawn" (curbside landscape). You should consider how to transition from turf permitted in earlier site plans to the water-wise designs that will be required in subsequent plans.

Response: The landscape plans were reviewed with the thought of beginning a transition to the new landscape standards that will be required in Area C and beyond. We determined that future areas (Area C and others) are removed from areas A and B by significant open spaces. We believe those open spaces will provide a more effective transition than having a few lots in Area B exhibit the new landscape standards.

Comment

3B. Provide landscape requirements for each proposed lot type (per Table 14.3A) based on lot width. Include requirements in 10' increments up to the width of the widest lot. Identify how many different plant types are required per yard and include a statement requiring a variation of landscape designs.

Response: The lot landscape plans have been modified accordingly.

Comment

3C. Provide landscape requirements for motor court lots. The landscape is required on all 4 lots. Include separate requirements for lots that front adjacent streets.

Response: The motor court lot landscape plans have been modified accordingly.

Comment

3D. Add a note to identify who is responsible for the maintenance of motor court shared drives, landscape, and fencing.

Response: A note has been added that clarifies the Metro District will be responsible for maintenance of the motor court shared drives, landscaping, and fences.

Comment

3E. Planning Area 30 is intended for non-residential/commercial uses. Per Table 14.2, provide a landscape buffer of 1 tree and 5 shrubs per 25 linear feet behind the residential lots. Add a Non-Street Buffer Table to identify the buffer requirements and landscape provided.

Response: A landscape buffer per table 14.2 has been added behind the residential lots. A non-street buffer table has been included to identify the buffer requirements and landscape provided.

Comment

3F. All landscape tracts should have 1 tree and 10 shrubs per 4,000 square feet. The landscape should be distributed throughout the tract. Please provide all required landscapes or provide an explanation for any deficiency.

Response: All landscape tracts now reflect the landscape requirements outlined above.

Comment

3G. A 20' landscape buffer is required where lots are adjacent to collector streets. The buffer should include 1 tree and 10 shrubs per 40 linear feet. The buffer should include shrubs in addition to grasses. Add a Street Buffer Table to identify the buffer requirements and landscape provided.

Response: Landscape buffers have been revised to meet the requirements above. A street buffer table has been included.

Comment

3H. Provide additional landscape including evergreen trees and shrubs in the buffer adjacent to the double-fronted lots to mitigate visibility.

Response: A note has been added that requires a minimum of 25% of the enhanced landscape for double fronted lots will be evergreen species.

Comment

3I. Some streets have more street trees than required, while others fall short. See redlines for comments where additional trees should be added. If the use of trees is limited, provide shrub equivalents.

Response: Street trees have been revised to meet the requirements.

Comment

3J. The Catalpa 'Timeless Beauty' is commonly called Desert Catalpa, however, it is not a catalpa species. Please replace this with a street tree.

Response: Catalpa 'Timeless Beauty' has been replaced with a street tree.

Comment

3K. Eastern Redbud does not thrive in Colorado. Replace or specify a cultivar that is tolerant of Colorado weather.

Response: Eastern redbud has been replaced with another species.

Comment

3L. The plant schedule includes 5-gallon shrubs and 1-gallon grasses, however, there are no 5-gallon shrubs included in the landscape tables. Please revise as needed.

Response: The landscape table has been revised to reflect the number of 5-gallon shrubs and 1-gallon grasses.

Comment

3M. Adjust the scale of plan symbols and legend symbols so they are consistent. The fence linework is very difficult to discern.

Response: Legend symbols have been revised to match plan symbol scale. Fence linework has been revised for clarity.

Comment

3N. Ensure a minimum 20' buffer is maintained from the back of the sidewalk along 48th Avenue.

Response: The rear lot lines in PA 29 have been adjusted to provide a minimum 20' buffer along 48th Avenue.

Comment

3O. Show the grayed-back outlines of the adjacent curbside and buffer landscape provided by separate site plans. Reference the name of the site plan and the case number.

Response: Adjacent curbside and buffer landscape provided by separate site plans have been included and grayed back. Site plan and the case numbers have been provided.

Comment

3P. Move tract labels so they are visible and horizontal. Add area to all tracts on the plans.

Response: The tract labels have the area added.

Comment

3Q. Add all required landscape notes.

Response: All required landscape notes have been included.

Comment

3R. Address all comments and notations on the redlines.

Response: All comments and notations on the redlines have been addressed.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**4. Civil Engineering****Comment**

4A. The Site Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the Preliminary Drainage Report is approved. Comments were provided on 8/3/22 and no subsequent submittal has been made.

Response: Acknowledged.

Comment

4B. For one-way travel on a loop lane, a minimum of 18' is required, for two-way travel, a minimum of 23' is required. Refer to Section 4.04.2.09 of the Roadway Manual.

Response: The loop lane section has been revised to be one way with an 18' travel way.

Comment

4C. Revise the loop lane section to include a fire lane, utility, and access easements.

Response: The loop lane section has been revised with additional easements labeled.

Comment

4D. Modify the PA-29 Offsite Infrastructure Improvement notes on Sheet 7 per the comments on the redlines.

Response: Note has been revised.

Comment

4E. Provide the centerline radius geometry on all site plan sheets.

Response: The centerline radius has been labeled.

Comment

4F. Clarify street light nomenclature (SL-1 for locals, 20' pole height, SL-3 for collector streets, 30' pole height). Pedestrian lights in parks and tracts are private. The "Pedestrian Light" is a streetlight.

Response: The legend has been revised to remove the reference to pedestrian lights.

Comment

4G. Adjust streetlight locations per the redlines.

Response: Street light locations have been adjusted.

Comment

4H. Label and/or revise street radii as noted.

Response: The centerline radius has been labeled.

Comment

4I. Add the following note to all sheets as indicated on the redlines:

"Private temporary swales shall be maintained by the owner or Metro District and slopes less than 2% will be permitted for up to 36 months or until adjacent development occurs. Otherwise, revisions shall be submitted for concrete low-flow trickle channels with a minimum 0.5% slope. In addition, the City reserves the right at any point to require the construction of the trickle channel should there be any issues with reduced capacity, sedimentation, ponding, or other items identified by the City Engineer."

Response: The requested note has been added.

Comment

4J. Indicate the direction of emergency overflow for detention ponds.

Response: The emergency overflow direction has been shown.

Comment

4K. Provide a minimum 2% slope for all non-paved areas.

Response: The grading has been revised.

5. Traffic Engineering**Site Plan****Comment**

5A. Update per the redline comments.

Response: The redline comments have been addressed.

Comment

5B. Add the note provided on Sheet 2.

Response: The escrow note has been added to sheet 2.

Comment

5C. Show how the alignment on 48th Avenue will line up with the future signalized crossing of 48th and Harvest.

Response: The crossing ramp of 48th Ave. at Harvest has been added.

Comment

5D. Add street name signs to all stop signs at intersections. Locate street name signs on all inside corners where the street name changes.

Response: The street name signs have been added to all stop signs. The method of showing the stop signs and street signs has been changed to a key note for clarity on the plans.

Comment

5E. The TIS indicates the approach at Jamestown St. to be right-in/right-out only. On the right-out approach, include signs indicating as such.

Response: The right lane must turn right sign has been added.

Comment

5F. Remove the crossing from the T-intersection. Defer 4-leg crossing for if/when access to PA-29 is confirmed/complete.

Response: The pedestrian crossings have been revised.

Comment

5G. Mail kiosks should be located so the closest edge is a minimum of 30' outside of the intersection.

Response: Mail kiosks have been revised to be located so the closest edge is a minimum of 30' outside of the intersection.

Comment

5H. Add/modify ramps as noted on the redlines.

Response: The T intersection ramps have been swamped as directed.

Comment

5I. Remove midblock crossing(s), and/or add marked crossing and signs.

Response: The pedestrian crossings have been added or removed.

Comment

5J. Add/modify signage as indicated on the redlines.

Response: The signs have been adjusted.

Comment

5K. Consider relocating the mail kiosk on Harvest Mile Street.

Response: The mail kiosk on Harvest Mile street has been revised.

Comment

5L. Add pedestrian crossing warning signs at the trail crossing on 43rd Place.

Response: Signage has been added to the site plan.

Comment

5M. Intersections shall meet at a 90-degree angle (+5degrees).

Response: The roadway intersection in Tract BB has been revised from a 12° angle to a 5° angle.

Comment

5N. Address all comments and notations on the redlines.

Response: Acknowledged.

6. Fire/Life Safety

Comment

6A. Label all fire lane easements within sections and plan sheets.

Response: Fire lane easement has been labeled on the typical section and the site plan.

7. Aurora Water

Comment

7A. Call out all connections to existing utilities.

Response: Labels have been added at the connections to the existing utilities.

Comment

7B. Ensure there is a 5' separation of mains and manholes from the curb.

Response: The alignments have been adjusted.

Comment

7C. Locate the water service tap at least 36" away from the nearest joint.

Response: 3' is provided, the tees are shown as 6' across at this scale.

Comment

7D. Add the notes provided on Sheet 37.

Response: The note has been added as note 3.

Comment

7E. Extend maintenance access to the top of outlet structure(s).

Response: The maintenance paths have been revised and added.

Comment

7F. Show slope at bottom of pond(s).

Response: Bottom slope labels have been added.

Comment

7G. Maintain a 10' separation between water and sanitary mains.

Response: The alignments have been adjusted.

Comment

7H. Revise manhole locations as noted on the redlines.

Response: The manholes have been revised.

8. PROS

Comment

8A. Note that there are several repeat comments that were not addressed with the first review; please review the tract tables and what is eligible for credit. Roadways do not count as open spaces.

Response: Tract tables have been reviewed and revised. Tracts with roadways have been removed from open space credit.

Comment

8B. Remove tracts with roadways from the open space credit.

Response: Tracts with roadways have been removed from open space credit.

Comment

8C. Remove median landscape areas from open space credit. They do not meet open space requirements.

Response: Median landscape areas have been removed from open space credit.

Comment

8D. Open space credit is requested for Tract I. Add seating and label the tract acreage on Sheet 62.

Response: Seating and tract acreage has been labeled on sheet 62.

Comment

8E. Identify security lighting in pocket parks.

Response: Security lighting in pocket parks is have been added to the plans.

Comment

8F. See all comments within the site plan.

Response: All comments on sheet 05 of the Site Plan have been addressed. Reference Comment 1A in this letter for response to comment regarding double fronted lots.

9. Real Property

Comment

9A. Label streets as public or private.

Response: All streets have been labeled as either public or private on the site plan sheets.

Comment

9B. Add the area for all tracts.

Response: All tracts have the area added.

Comment

9C. Label all existing and proposed easements.

Response: All easements have been labeled.

Comment

9D. Ensure all blocks are labeled. Revise as noted.

Response: Additional block labels have been added.

Comment

9E. Address all comments and notations on the redlines.

Response: Acknowledged.

10. Xcel Energy

Comment

10A. Xcel has no additional comments from the Right of Way Referral Desk.

Response: No Action required.

11. Aurora Public Schools (APS)b

Comment

11A. APS will request cash-in-lieu of land when the balance of the obligation from approved site plans exceeds the acreage of school sites to be dedicated. In accordance with Section 4.3.18 of the Unified Development Ordinance, land value for cash-in-lieu will be based on the fair market value of zoned land with infrastructure in place. The land use obligation for this site plan is updated based on the number of planned residential units.

Aurora Highlands North Area B - Site Plan (DA-2062-33)

Dwelling Type	Units	Yield Ratio	Student Yield
SFD	589	0.7	412
MF-LOW		0.3	0
MF-HIGH		0.145	0
TOTAL	589		412

YIELD	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE SCHOOL		K-8 TOTAL	HIGH SCHOOL		K-12
	RATIO	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	TOTAL
SF	0.34	200	0.16	94	295	0.2	118	412
MF-LOW	0.17	0	0.08	0	0	0.05	0	0
MF-HIGH	0.075	0	0.04	0	0	0.03	0	0
TOTAL		200		94	295		118	412

SCHOOL TYPE	STUDENT YIELD	ACRES PER CHILD	ACRES REQUIRED
ELEMENTARY	200	0.0175	3.5046
MIDDLE	94	0.025	2.3560
HIGH	118	0.032	3.7696
TOTAL	412		9.6302

Aurora Highlands Development Tracking - 12/19/2022

Filing

CSP 1

CSP 2 DA-2062-06

Plat 4 DA-2062-10

Plat 5 DA-2062-11

Plat 8 DA-2062-14

Plat 10 DA-2062-16

Site Plan 14 DA-2062-20

Site Plan 16 DA-2062-23

Plat 6 DA-2062-13

Plat 13 DA-2062-17

Site Plan 15 DA-2062-21

Site Plan 17 DA-2062-26

Aurora Highlands North A DA-2062-31

Aurora Highlands North Area B DA-2062-33

Site Plan 7 DA-2062-36

Site Plan NO 21 DA-2062-37

Total

SFD	MFL	MFH	Total Units	K-8	HS	Total Yield	Dedication Requirement	Status
84			84	42	17	59	1.3734	Approved
182	44		226	102	39	141	3.265	Approved
9			9	5	2	7	0.1472	Approved
47			47	24	9	33	0.7685	Approved
174			174	87	35	122	2.8449	Approved
176			176	88	35	123	2.8776	Approved
156	62		218	94	34	128	2.9583	Approved
273			273	137	55	192	4.4636	Approved
26			26	13	5	18	0.4251	Final Mylars
13			13	7	3	10	0.2126	Tech Subm
295	122		417	178	65	243	5.6254	Final Mylars
97			97	49	19	68	1.586	Tech Subm
618	100		718	334	129	463	10.7618	2nd Submittal
589			589	295	118	413	9.6302	2nd Submittal
51	38		89	35	12	47	1.0837	2nd Submittal
82	96		178	65	21	86	1.9719	1st Submittal
2,872	462	0	3,334	1,555	598	2,153	49.9952	

Response:

Sincerely,

MATRIX DESIGN GROUP, INC.



Jeff Killion, PE

cc: 21.1229.002