

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



November 2, 2021

Chris Fellows
Painted Prairie Owner, LLC
5600 Greenwood Plaza Boulevard, Suite 220
Greenwood Village, CO 80111

Re: Second Submission Review: Painted Prairie Town Center Residential – Master Plan Amendment, Site Plan with Adjustments and Subdivision Plat
Application Number: DA-1556-15
Case Numbers: 2006-7003-05; 2021-4020-00; 2021-3041-00

Dear Mr. Fellows:

Thank you for your second submission, which we received on October 12, 2021. We reviewed it 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 outside agencies. Staff would be happy to meet with you and your design team in the next couple weeks to discuss these comments and address any questions or issues you may have.

Since many important issues still remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before November 24, 2021 to remain on schedule.

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.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please give me a call. I may be reached at 303-739-7857.

Sincerely,

Sarah Wile, AICP
Senior Planner, City of Aurora
Planning & Development Services Department

cc: Mark Naylor, Civitas, 1200 Bannock St., Denver, CO 80204
Daunte Rushton, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\1556-15rev2.rtf



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Update the Letter of Introduction
- Remove all multi-family buildings from the Site Plan as the required details have not been provided (see Item 3)
- Provide all requested information for the Lot Layout details and the Lot Data table (see Item 3)
- Include sufficient justification, mitigation, and graphics for all adjustment requests (see Item 4)
- Ensure consistency between the Site Plan and Design Standards (see Item 6)
- Update the Design Standards to include conceptual elevations and more architectural enhancements (see Item 6)
- Update the Landscape Plan to ensure compliance with UDO requirements (see Item 8)
- Address Landscape comments in the Design Standards (see Item 8)
- Coordinate proposed alley paving and identify requested engineering information (see Item 9)
- Provide pedestrian connectivity for all buildings (see Item 10)
- Move requested meters per Aurora Water comments (see Item 11)
- Revise note regarding architectural feature encroachments and address comments on the Plat (see Item 12)
- Address fire lane width, accessibility, paving, and other Fire / Life Safety requirements (see Item 13)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. No comments were received with this submittal, so a neighborhood meeting is not required at this time. If any comments are received in the future, this will be reevaluated.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

2A. Please update the Letter of Introduction to provide clarification on certain items and to remove all information related to multi-family as those buildings cannot be processed under this Site Plan (see Item 3). Significant changes are needed to the adjustment section as well (see Item 4).

2B. Please add categories or details to the Data Block per redline comments.

2C. Make revisions to the Data Block as some of the information does not seem accurate.

2D. Please reduce the size of the existing Sheet Index as there will need to be building elevation sheets added to the plan set in the future as part of the required Site Plan Amendment. This could add a significant number of sheets and there needs to be space below the existing Sheet Index to include those sheets in the future.

2E. Revise the Vicinity Map to show a smaller area so that the boundaries of the Site Plan

2F. Please refer to unit / lot types consistently throughout all documents. The Site Plan refers to “narrow townhomes,” “townhomes,” and “pinwheel townhomes,” whereas other documents refer to “tandem townhomes,” “carriage townhomes,” and “three-story row towns.”

2G. There are some incorrect references to other Site Plans / ISPs and Plats throughout the Site Plan. Please review redline comments and ensure these are updated with the next submittal.

2H. The city has developed [CAD Data Submittal Standards](#) for internal and external use to streamline the process of importing AutoCAD information into the City's Enterprise GIS. A digital submission meeting the CAD Data Submittal Standards is required before final mylars can be routed for signatures or recorded for all applications. Please review these standards and ensure that files are in the correct format to avoid future delays.



3. Zoning and Land Use Issues

3A. As discussed in previous conversations with the applicant, all multi-family buildings need to be removed from this Site Plan because the required information is not being provided (building footprints, building elevations, number of units, accessible routes, building entrances, etc.). Please identify these parcels as “Future Multi-Family” on all sheets. New, separate Site Plans will be required for these buildings.

3B. Please note that because no details have been provided for the retail or multi-family parcels, staff has not evaluated the feasibility of these parcels from a parking, lot size, landscaping, open space, etc. perspective. Allowing these lots to be platted does not imply that they meet UDO standards and/or will be acceptable necessarily when Site Plans are submitted in the future. It is at the applicant's own risk to move forward with these layouts for these uses and compliance with the UDO will be reviewed in the future. If adjustments are needed, those future Site Plans will require public hearings.

3C. Address redline comments on the Lot Data Table on Sheet 3 regarding some of the proposed setbacks and potential issues.

3D. The Lot Layout details on Sheet 3 are not detailed enough. Dimensions need to be provided identifying setbacks, easement locations and widths, minimum lot sizes, minimum porch sizes, maximum building footprints, garage sizes, and planter locations. These are important in ensuring that the proposed lot sizes will work, especially given the adjustment requests.

3E. The lot sizes for the “pinwheel townhome” and “narrow townhome” lots in the Lot Type Legend on Sheet 3 do not appear consistent with the proposed minimum lot sizes. See redline comments.

3F. Please note that there are approximately 17 townhomes that are considered green court units. Green courts are not permitted in the MU-R District currently. An amendment to the UDO is required to permit this use prior to the Site Plan being recorded. The lots are not considered “townhome lots” as they front on an open space, not a street.

3G. All site features, such as retaining walls, planters, and other above-ground structures, need to be labeled and called out on all sheets within the plan set. Some items are not labeled, and it is unclear where items are proposed.

3H. Details need to be provided for all proposed elements on the site, including all pavers (with colors identified), tables, trash cans, bicycle racks, fences, retaining walls, planters, benches, etc.

3I. All ground equipment must be shown on the Site Plan and all equipment must be screened. The response to comments letter stated that these are shown on the Utility Plan, but they are not. Please identify locations with the next submittal on all sheets.

3J. The Design Standards state that raised planters will be provided in between garages for the townhome units, but planters are not called out on the Landscape Plan and no plant material appears to be shown in this area. Please identify these with the next submittal.

3K. The Photometric Plan does not appear to call out all fixtures and some lighting appears to be missing compared to what is envisioned on other sheets within the plan set and within the Design Standards. Please update this to ensure consistency.

3L. Because multi-family buildings cannot be approved as part of this Site Plan as noted above, please revise the Accessibility Plan document to account for this.

3M. The city’s standard note regarding encroachments into easements cannot be modified. See comments from Real Property on Sheet 3.



4. Adjustments

4A. Please remove all adjustments requests related to the multi-family buildings from the Site Plan and Letter of Introduction. As noted above, these cannot be reviewed at this time and will need to be requested with future Site Plan submittals.

4B. The “Adjustments” section in the Letter of Introduction needs to be revised. For each adjustment request, you must outline what the specific adjustment request is, what the justification is, and how you are mitigating the potential negative impacts of the adjustment. In addition, please provide a graphic for each adjustment that outlines which areas the adjustment request is for. Staff cannot adequately review the adjustment requests without this information. Review redline comments for further comments.

4C. The Cover Sheet should only identify the code section, the code requirement, and the adjustment request. All justification and extraneous information should be in the Letter of Introduction.

5. Streets, Pedestrian, and Parking Issues

5A. Please clarify why parking spaces are being provided adjacent to woonerfs and street frontages. These seem counterintuitive to the desired pedestrian-friendly, walkable environment that is outlined in the Design Standards. If all townhome units will have two garage parking spaces and there is on-street parking on adjacent streets, it is unclear why these are needed. No response was provided to this comment previously.

5B. If there will be surface parking spaces provided, all spaces need to be dimensioned. In addition, it appears that the spaces surrounding Tract L have inconsistent sizing and some of the end spaces appear very narrow.

5C. A few of the townhome lots do not appear to have direct connections to sidewalks. Please review redline comments and ensure that all units have access to a sidewalk.

5D. Please provide additional information regarding the proposed paving materials in the alleys and woonerfs. The naming is not consistent with the pavement options in the Design Standards, so it is unclear what is proposed.

6. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

6A. As noted in previous discussions, all projects that include single-family attached townhomes are required to provide building elevations in the Site Plan package and are reviewed as part of the Site Plan process. Staff will allow townhome elevations for this particular project to be submitted at a later date, but this means that the architectural standards are even more important (see comments below). There also needs to be conceptual elevations provided in the Design Standards that illustrate the required quality for all product types. These conceptual elevations need to account for lot sizes, garage locations, porch size constraints, etc. and should not be copied from another development with different conditions. Please note that building elevations will need to be added to the Site Plan (in the same format as the current plan set) as part of a minor Site Plan Amendment process prior to builders submitting building permits to the city.

6B. In staff’s review of woonerfs that have been successfully implemented in other countries, traffic calming and wayfinding / shared space signage were two important elements. These elements have not been addressed in the current submittal and need to be. Although staff understands that there are requirements from other departments that could pose challenges, these items and others noted below are needed to carry out the vision of the woonerfs that was outlined in early discussions with the city.

6C. The “graphic booklet” referenced in the Letter of Introduction is not an official submittal document. If there is a desire to have portions of the graphic booklet be reviewed, please incorporate this into the Design Standards with the next submittal.



6D. There are some inconsistencies between what is illustrated in the Design Standards and what is shown in the Site Plan. Please review redline comments in both documents and ensure these are addressed with the next submittal.

6E. In addition to the other items discussed in this section, the architectural standards need to address items such as ground floor design (especially on the sides of the buildings as most of the ground floors will be taken up by garages), architectural diversity requirements for all product types, and additional architectural enhancements given the adjustment requests. See redline comments.

6F. All product types that are adjacent to a woonerf or an alley that leads to a woonerf shall provide a minimum of two articulation methods for each condition (unit entry, upper level, corner, and garage). Corner articulation needs to extend to the back of buildings if they are adjacent to a woonerf or an alley that leads to a woonerf as well. Garage articulation should also be addressed for all product types, not just pinwheel townhomes. See redline comments for additional information and update graphics and text accordingly.

6G. For the architectural standards, please change “guidelines” to “standards” as these should be requirements, not options.

6H. Please develop a “tier” system for the articulation options that will ensure higher quality design. For example, a building shouldn’t be able to meet the two requirements for entry articulation by choosing a covered entry and a cantilevered covered entry. Similarly, window changes shouldn’t account for both upper-level articulation enhancements.

6J. The Design Standards are considered an amendment to the existing Painted Prairie Town Center Design Standards (not an addendum) and need to fit within the context of that document. For example, the table of contents should be added to the existing table of contents instead of having a new table of contents in the middle of the Design Standards. Please review redline comments and revise page numbers accordingly.

6K. Please address other miscellaneous comments throughout the Design Standards and contact your Case Manager if there are any questions.

7. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7271 / pturner@auroragov.org)

7A. 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 (if available) at minimum. Please ensure that the digital file is provided in the correct projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. More information can be found [here](#).

8. Landscaping Issues (Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal)

Design Standards

8A. Don’t highlight the woonerfs on Page 73 if the purpose is to show the paseos and entry courts.

8B. Mineral or crusher fines are not a permitted mulch treatment around plants.

8C. Address redline comments regarding the “gathering courts” on Page 88.

8D. The rea outlined in periwinkle on Page 89 appears to be tract landscaping. While some of the plant material along the southern sides of these buildings may count toward the required building perimeter landscape requirements, building perimeter landscaping is for the building perimeter and is not intended to be planted on only one side. Where there are no garage doors or pedestrian doors, there should be landscaping.

8E. The text on Page 90 regarding upgraded plant sizes needs to be removed entirely or updated to reflect the proposed housing products. The statement is not accurate.



Site Plan – General Comments

- 8F. Remove the General Landscape Notes from all the Site Material and Plan Enlargement sheets.
- 8G. Add the Case Number (CN 2020-6049-00) for the Town Center ISP where requested.
- 8H. Gray back the landscaping that is being shown as part of the Town Center ISP.
- 8I. All multi-family buildings should be removed and submitted as a separate Site Plan. Please remove those buildings from this plan set and the associated landscaping unless the landscaping is being provided to meet tract landscape requirements.

Sheet 28

- 8J. Update the General Landscape Notes per redline comments.
- 8K. Perennials have been listed under shrubs in the plant list. Provide a separate category for perennials.
- 8L. What is the graphic titled “Landscape Graphic” to be used for? It doesn’t seem to match any of the tables that have been provided.

Sheet 29

- 8M. Remove the column referring to 6’ tall shrubs. There is not a requirement for shrubs to be 6’ tall or any specific height for the tract landscaping.
- 8N. Provide a graphic that depicts where the tracts are that are provided in the Tract Landscape table. Keep it simple with no plants being provided.

Sheet 30

- 8O. Remove the duplicative notes.
- 8P. Text mask to improve plant label legibility.
- 8Q. Label the future retail site. This comments also applies to Sheet 33.
- 8R. There appear to just be ornamental grasses in some of the raised planters, which means that there will be not plant material most of the year.

Sheet 31

- 8S. Call out the plant quantities and add plant labels.

Sheet 36

- 8T. Label the parking spaces. The end islands look like they need to be expanded as there is leftover area at the ends of the rows that cannot be parked in.

Sheet 38

- 8U. Provide details / elevations of the proposed raised planters being used in the woonerfs, paseos, and entry courts.
- 8V. Are the proposed pavers the same as the ones being used for the enhanced alleys? Or are these the ones for the main alley areas? Include that information in the detail call out. What color is anticipated for these?
- 8W. Is this the concrete paving detail for the walks within the development or is this supposed to be the concrete paving for the alleys that is vehicular rated with an upgraded finish? What color is anticipated? Please clarify.



REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

9. Civil Engineering (Julie Bingham / 303-739-7403 / jbingham@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

- 9A. The Site Plan will not be approved by Public Works until the Preliminary Drainage Report is approved.
- 9B. Call out retaining walls on all sheets.
- 9C. Revise the note about the storm drain facilities being public on all sheets.
- 9D. Call out the adjacent ROWs on all sheets and make the boundaries clear.
- 9E. Per the Roadway Manual (Section 4.04.2.06), alleys shall be paved in concrete. Any deviation from this must be coordinated with Haley Busch Johansen. Please resolve this prior to the next submittal.
- 9F. 0.5% minimum slope is only applicable to concrete. The minimum slope is 1.0% typically.
- 9G. There is an additional storm and an inlet shown on the Overall Grading Plan than what is on Sheets 11, 12 and 13.
- 9H. Provide a maximum height or height range for the proposed retaining wall and the material type. If the wall is over 30", a railing is required. If the wall is over 4', structural calculations are required. Please also provide a standard section.
- 9I. Show and label proposed mail kiosk locations.

10. Traffic Engineering (Kyle Morris / 303-799-5103 / kmorris@bhinc.com / Comments in orange)

- 10A. Modify the walkways on Sheet 4 to provide a directional crossing and include additional connections.
- 10B. Provide pedestrian connectivity for all buildings. This is missing for many of the buildings. See redline comments on Sheet 4.
- 10C. There is a potential sidewalk conflict with the retaining wall. Please revise.
- 10D. Show stop signs where alleys connect to streets.

11. Aurora Water (Casey Ballard / 303-739-7382 / cballard@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

- 11A. Move the meters noted on Sheet 15 closer to the public ROW. Have the private service laterals extend along the alley sides of the lots and include private easements so that property owners can repair their service lines as necessary.
- 11B. Have the meters noted on Sheet 16 match the setup to the south. Easements are required around all meters as called out in Section 5.04.
- 11C. Confirm hydrant placements with Fire / Life Safety on Sheet 16. The main should be looped to support hydrant coverage.

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

- 12A. In the lot layouts on Sheet 3, a portion of the building is shown in an easement. No building can encroach into any easements.



12B. A note regarding architectural feature encroachments was amended since the last submittal. Change it back to “Architectural features (i.e. bay windows, fireplaces, roof overhangs, gutters, eaves, foundations, footings, cantilevered walls, etc.) are not allowed to encroach into any easement or fire lane.”

12C. If the alley tracts have public access easements in them, the pavers will need to be covered by a license agreement in those tract areas. Contact Grace Gray to start this process.

12D. Address all redline comments on the Site Plan and Plat.

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

13A. As mentioned during the first review, additional details and information is required for R2's multi-family buildings. A thorough Fire / Life Safety review cannot be conducted at this time due to the incomplete details about the multi-family products. The delay of providing requested information during the first and second reviews may result in additional new comments during subsequent reviews, which can have an adverse impact on review times.

13B. An adequate review of the Site Plan cannot be performed due to the lack of information about the multi-family dwelling production. Please provide additional details or remove all multi-family from the Site Plan per Planning comments.

13C. In the Data Block, indicate if structures are fire sprinkled or non-fire sprinkled. As well as the maximum building height and the actual height

13D. Provide the number of required and provide accessible and van accessible parking spaces.

13E. Provide a completed Implementation Plan per redline comments on Sheet 2 and identify accessible units.

13F. Buildings or portions of buildings or facilities exceeding 30 feet in height above the lowest level of fire department vehicle access shall be provided with approved fire apparatus access roads capable of accommodating fire department aerial apparatus. The required access routes meeting this condition shall be located within a minimum of 15 feet and a maximum of 30 feet from the building, and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building per IFC Section D105.

13G. Several identified 23' wide fire lane easements may need to be revised to 26' to meet minimum requirements.

13H. If mail kiosks are being proposed, has the USPS been contacted to determine if the proposed mail kiosk locations are acceptable?

13I. Identify if mail kiosks are going to be provided. If mail kiosks are being provided, show locations and provide a detail to include accessibility requirements. Reference United States Postal Service, U.S. Postal Service National Delivery Planning Standards A Guide for Builders and Developers.

13J. Are there any one-way streets within this site? If so, please identify them.

13K. Add the requested note to Sheet 19 per redline comments.

13L. Address redline comments on the Photometric Plan.

13M. Any proposed use of alternative surfacing materials (e.g. concrete paver, etc.) for fire lanes must be submitted for approval in writing to the City Engineer of Public Works. A license agreement must be obtained through Real Property for the installation of any alternative surfacing material used within dedicated fire lane easements.



14. Aurora Public Schools ([Josh Hensley / 303-365-7812 / \[jdhensley@aurorak12.org\]\(mailto:jdhensley@aurorak12.org\)](mailto:Josh.Hensley@aurorak12.org))

14A. The total school land dedication requirement for Painted Prairie based on the approved Master Plan is approximately 37 acres. The Master Plan includes a 16.25 acre school site dedication. This site is sufficient for the district to construct a P-8 school with capacity to serve the Painted Prairie community. Aurora Public Schools agreed to apply the school dedication requirement for the purposes of calculating cash-in-lieu of land as site plans are approved for Painted Prairie. The district will request cash-in-lieu of land when the balance of the obligation from approved site plans exceeds 16.25 acres. Cash-in-lieu of land is required to serve high school age students at a district location outside of Painted Prairie.

14B. Depending on the timing of when current Site Plan and Plat applications are approved, cash-in-lieu of school land may be required for this proposal. In accordance with Section 4.3.18(A) of the Unified Development Ordinance, land value for cash-in-lieu will be based on fair market value of zoned land with infrastructure in place.