

July 12, 2017

Ms. Heather Lamboy
City of Aurora, Planning Department
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, 2nd Floor
Aurora, Colorado 80012

Re: Kings Point CSP No. 2 / Final Plat No. 2 Response to Second Submission Review
Application Number: **DA-1609-17**
Case Numbers: **2016-4013-00; 2016-3041-00**

Dear Heather:

Enclosed herein are the review comments provided to us in regards to the second submittal of the Kings Point CSP No. 2 and Final Plat No. 2. These have been addressed and are included with this letter.

Please let me know if you have any questions or require any additional information. We look forward to continued work with the City of Aurora throughout the review and approval process of this exciting new project.

Sincerely,
Norris Design



Eva Mather
Principal

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community and External Agency Comments

1A. During this review cycle staff received 1 comment from the public.

Name: Susan Harter

Address: Himalaya Way Centennial CO 80016 Phone: 720-308-7730

Email: susiemharter@gmail.com

I am very concerned about the access from Kings Point into Antelope subdivision and all the traffic it will bring through. We have narrow roads, no sidewalks, horses with horse trails and this will be the most direct route to Arapahoe Road and any roads to the north. We have children waiting on the side of the road daily and already have many extra cars and buses going through Antelope to two schools everyday! We have a gentleman in our neighborhood that is in a wheelchair and he and his work dog are on the street often and have to do that with no sidewalks extra pavement on the narrow roads. Our roads are definitely not built for construction traffic. I worry that Dry Creek Road or a Parker Road access will not be put in before construction starts. There is a huge parking problem and many cars parked along both sides of the road at Creekside Elem. during drop off and pick up times, this makes it very difficult to get through the road. I feel Kings Point should add additional parking on their side of the road if allowed to go ahead with the project. Antelope has always had a rural feeling even with all the growth, but know we will lose this from the thousands of cars that will drive by daily if Kings Point is allowed to drive through Antelope.

What a huge safety issue it will be for us. It saddens me to think of the changes that will happen now after almost 33 years of living here.

Response: The email from Susan Harter expresses concern over the access into the Antelope neighborhood from Kings Point. While we empathize with her concern over the encroachment into their rural lifestyle, the many impacted entities did not support the closure of S. Ireland Way at Long Avenue. The revised plan presents a circuitous route that will need to be navigated to exit Kings Point northbound on S. Ireland Way. Additionally, the connection of E. Dry Creek Road from Liberty Middle School west to Parker Road (via E. Aurora Parkway) has the potential to reduce trips through the Antelope neighborhood.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

Address the following items:

2A. Please make the corrections shown on the redlines throughout the Master Plan set.

Response: The corrections shown on the redlines throughout the Master Plan set have been addressed.

2B. Please address comments regarding the infrastructure from Craig Perl (Civil Engineering) and Victor Rachael (Traffic).

Response: Requested updates to the Traffic Impact Study will be completed and submitted to the

City of Aurora when completed.

3. Phasing and Transportation Planning Issues

3A. CDOT has provided comment regarding Aurora Parkway. Please continue to work with Victor Rachel and Rick Solomon regarding these comments.

Response: The applicant is committed to work with the City of Aurora and CDOT pertaining to possible concerns regarding Aurora Parkway and SH 83.

4. Landscape Design Issues

Debbie Bickmire/ dbickmire@auroragov.org/ (303) 739-7/ Comments in teal clouds.

Please address the following items:

4A. There is a general issue that all trees are included in the Tract Landscape Table, including mitigation and transfers. The counts are not proving consistent with the number of trees in the provided column. Also, Note 1 on Sheet L1.04 states 88 required street trees may be located outside the ROW. How are trees differentiated from tract trees? A few tree counts have been shown in the table to demonstrate our tree count vs. what is shown. Additional information for the distribution of material is required and may result in additional comments.

Response: Comment noted. Plans have been revised to show accurate calculations.

4B. Mitigation trees shall not be counted toward the landscape buffer requirement. If necessary, revise calculations and plans accordingly.

Response: Calculations and plans have been revised. Mitigation trees are not being counted toward the landscape buffer requirement.

4C. Tract total area references in the Tract Landscape Table differ from the references on the CSP sheets. Please revise.

Response: CSP Tract totals have been revised.

4D. Not all transfers referenced in the notes are identified on the landscape sheets. All transfer trees should be marked with a "T".

Response: Comment noted. All transfer trees are marked with a "T".

4E. Note 4 on Sheet L1.03 states 20 TE have been relocated to Tract A. No transfers are noted in Tract A. Additionally, 32 trees are required in Tract A and we count 49 trees, not including mitigation trees. The math does not support 20 TE in Tract A.

Response: Comment noted. Math has been recalculated to include all transfer trees.

4F. Landscape that is relocated/transferred to another tract shall not be counted toward the recipient tract's landscape. Relocated plants shall be over and above the requirement for the recipient tract.

Response: Landscape that is relocated/transferred to another tract is not being counted toward said tract's landscape calculations.

4G. Revise title on sheets to include "with Waivers" as shown on redlines. Identify the waiver for column spacing, as

well as the justification, on Sheet L1.01.

Response: Comment noted. Title has been revised.

4H. Revise the notes on Sheet L1.01 as noted on the redlines.

Response: Comment noted. The notes on Sheet L1.01 were revised.

4I. Add a detail for light poles to the CSP to demonstrate compliance with the FDP architectural standards.

Response: Due to the uncertainty of the utility provider for street lights, a street light detail cannot be provided at this time. The following note has been added to the cover sheet: "All street lights shall be consistent with the character of the FDP."

4J. Show light poles on landscape plans, including lights proposed in the NAC and open space areas, if applicable. Add symbol to legend.

Response: Comment noted. All light poles shown on landscape plans. Street light symbol is included in the legend.

4K. Provide the calculations to demonstrate compliance for a maximum of 33% cool season grasses. Show in Hydro- zone Table on Sheet L5.01.

Response: Calculations have been shown on Sheet L5.01 to demonstrate that the cool season grasses do not exceed 33%.

4L. The screen material around the playground parking lot is very seasonal. For example, maintenance of Russian sage calls for the plants to be cut back almost to the ground in late winter to early spring. Please replace or supplement with plant material that will provide more year round coverage. Screening should consist of a low continuous landscaped hedge between 2½ and 3 feet high consisting of a double row of shrubs planted 3 feet on center in a triangular pattern.

Response: Russian Sage has been replaced with Ivory Halo Dogwood.

4M. Yucca is not an acceptable screen material and should not be used next to pedestrian areas. Please replace.

Response: Yucca has been replaced with Dwarf Burning Bush.

4N. Add colors to the materials descriptions for fences, columns and walls on Sheets L4.01- L4.02.

Response: Material colors for the fences, columns and walls will be specified at time of CD's.

5. Process

5A. This CSP is being administratively reviewed. This case is scheduled for an administrative decision on June 28, 2017. You will be sent a notice of pending administrative decision no later than June 15, 2017; this will need to be mailed by June 17, 2017. Failure to notice will delay your administrative decision.

Response: Per discussion with City of Aurora staff, the administrative decision date was moved to July 26, 2017. A mailing noticing adjacent property owners of this decision will be mailed by the Applicant no later than Friday, July 14, 2017.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

6. Addressing

Cathryn Day, Planner II/GIS Addresser, cday@auroragov.org, 303-739-7357

6A. Cathryn Day will provide street name revisions to applicant directly via e-mail.

Response: Street name revisions have been incorporated through the application.

7. Civil Engineering

Craig Perl, Senior Engineer - cperl@auroragov.org - 303-739-7532

7A. Inconsistencies remain between roadway designations and right-of-way width. See specific conflicts marked in green on Site Plan and Plat, but also perform a full consistency check before resubmitting.

Suggest showing less detail on Antelope Creek, such as not showing check structures or riprap, as the channel design is subject to substantial revision, so these features shouldn't be shown on the CSP.

Response: The inconsistencies have been fixed and full backcheck has been completed. The channel improvements along Antelope Creek has been removed. A note has been added to page 2 indicating any channel improvements will be coordinated with UDFCD and Aurora.

8. Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS)

Chris Ricciardiello / cricciar@auroragov.org / 303-739-7154

8A. Cash in lieu of community park land dedication in accordance with City of Aurora PROS standards is due prior to the recordation of first plat for Kings Point. Provide a certified appraisal for use in the land valuation for cash in lieu calculations.

Response: Comment noted.

8B. If the applicant/developer has a recent appraisal report (generally dated within the past 6 months) or other document, such as an agreement of sale, we could review that to determine whether it adequately reflect an estimated market value for the site. The document would be looked at both by PROS and Real Property Services staff to ensure the value is in accordance with City Code.

8C. Alternatively, the city's Real Property Services staff could generate a per-acre value based on their knowledge and judgement of the market. This option is sometimes used if the developer doesn't have a recent appraisal or wants to avoid going to the expense of hiring an appraiser. No report or written analysis is prepared. All that is provided is a per-acre value for consideration. The applicant/developer isn't bound to accept the city's number and has the option to still produce an appraisal or agreement with an alternative number for the city to review.

Response: The applicant is working with the Parks Department on this item.

9. Forestry

Jacque Chomiak / jchomiak@auroragov.org / 303-739-7178

9A. The inches added into the Landscape Plan fulfill the tree loss that needs to be replaced for Filing 2. However, the TPP still needs to be refined and it was not included in this set of submittals.

Response: Per previous conversation with Jacque, all items have been discussed and addressed. A revised Tree Protection Plan has been included with this resubmittal.

10. Real Property

Darren Akrie/ dakrie@auroragov.org / 303-739-7331

10A. As of the date of this review letter, no comments have been received.

Response: Comment noted. If and when Real Property comments are received, they will be addressed in a separate document.

11. Life Safety

John J. Van Essen, Plan Examiner III, (303) 739-7489, jvanesse@auroragov.org

11A. No comments at this time.

Response: Thank you.

12. Traffic

Reviewed by: Victor Rachael / vrachael@auroragov.org / (303) 739-7309

12A. The Traffic Impact Study is under review in a parallel process. The Study has been referred to the Colorado Department of Transportation for review.

Response: Requested updates to the Traffic Impact Study will be completed and submitted to the City of Aurora when completed.

13. Aurora Water

Reviewed by: Jonathan Villines / jvilline@auroragov.org / (303) 739-7646 / Comments are in red.

13A. Please see redlines on the Utility Plan. Important issues to discuss include pressure zone transitions and ensuring proper infrastructure is in place for a future booster pump. Contact Jonathan Villines to schedule a meeting.

Response: Redlines have been addressed and coordination regarding pressures zones and required infrastructure has been completed. Per coordination with Aurora Water a note regarding meter pit locations has been added in lieu of showing all meter pits and utility services.

14. Xcel Energy

Reviewed by: Donna George, Right of Way & Permits / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com / (303) 571-3524

14A. PSCo's Referral Desk acknowledges the comment response and requested changes that were made to the plat and has no further concerns.

Response: Comment noted; thank you.

15. CDOT

Reviewed by: Richard Solomon, Region One Permit Unit Supervisor / richard.solomon@state.co.us / (303) 757-9345

15A. Comments were provided as part the of CSP #1 review. While that mostly refers to the Parker Road intersection, you may want to refer to the comments to see if there are any implications in CSP #2.

Response: The plan contemplates the tie-in of Aurora Parkway and SH 83 as a signalized intersection. The applicant is aware that in the future this may require a grade separated interchange. The applicant is committed to work with the City of Aurora and CDOT pertaining to possible concerns regarding Aurora Parkway and SH 83.

CDOT expressed concern that the twenty year projections utilized in the Traffic Impact Study were for future year 2035, instead of 2040, which is the new baseline for DRCOG. The year 2035 was used as the base year analysis was performed in 2015 and more importantly it aligned with the Parker Road Study that was previously prepared. Given the significant effort and cost to redo all future analysis for year 2040, we propose to run the DRCOG Sketch Model for year 2040 and perform a sensitivity analysis on the volumes on Parker Road to determine the difference between the traffic volumes for year 2035 versus year 2040. If the difference is not significant we propose that a new analysis is not required.

Applicant is aware that a connection to SH 83 will require a permit from CDOT.

16. Moye White Letter

Response: On June 20,2017, Moye White counsel for the Chenango Homeowners Association, sent a letter to Heather Lamboy of the City of Aurora Planning Department. The letter alleges the re-submittal of the CSP for Kings Point Filing No. 2 contains “Material Changes” as defined in the Amended and Restated Agreement between The Chenango Homeowners Association and Kingspoint LLC. Specifically it states that “ The Material Changes include, but are not limited to, Kings Point improperly altering the size and configuration of Land Use Areas L11, L9 and M16.”

The Applicant agrees that lot 1 of block 8 is outside of the allowable planning area for L11. This lot has been removed for the re-submitted CSP and Plat for Filing No. 2. The Applicant does not believe that the perimeter boundary for Land Use Areas L9 and M16 have been moved by 10 feet or more. There are several lots that fall within both land use areas, which is not a violation of the Agreement or the FDP Mitigation Measures. However, in good faith the Applicant has modified three lots to ensure that lots containing both planning areas in excess of 10’ from the centerline, are located in the more restrictive land use, which is Land Use Area L9. We have attached a map with dimensions of the impacted areas for L9 and M16.

