

October 8, 2020

Dan Osoba, Planner II  
City of Aurora  
Planning Division  
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, Ste. 2300  
Aurora, Colorado 80012

**RE: Lamar Landing Master Plan**

Dear Mr. Osoba:

Thank you for the comments on August 19, 2020 for the above-mentioned project. In an effort to address your comments concisely and simplify your review of the site plan, we have summarized your comments and our responses below.

## **COMMENT RESPONSE LETTER: INITIAL SUBMISSION REVIEW**

### **SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS**

- The walkable main street must continue north and connect to the E. 5th Avenue alignment. This must be shown on all Master Plan tabs.
- The focal point does not meet the definition for a focal point (see Item 3C).
- Additional information and a narrative is required for Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan. What is the phasing order for this development; how will looped water, utilities, and two points of access be provided for each phase; what public infrastructure is required for each phase; and what are the development triggers and responsibilities for all of the above?
- Design details and photographic or diagrammatic examples need to be provided for urban design standards found in Tab 10 and landscape standards found in Tab 11. Simply stating, “This Urban Design feature shall comply with this FDP (\*Master Plan) and if not mentioned, the applicable zoning code in effect for the time of site plan submittal shall govern” for all urban design features is not acceptable.
- The completion of the north half of E. 6th Pkwy is required with any development within this Master Plan as well as the N. Gun Club Rd improvements along the full frontage, not just the southern parcel. This was indicated in the Pre-App Notes due to the development in the area.
- Land dedication requirements and the proposed method of how they will be satisfied should be explicitly presented in Form J to be added to Tab 9. Additionally, lines 2 and 21 through 24 of Form D should be amended to indicate the intent to provide on-site park and open space acreage, if applicable (see Item 13E).

### **PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

#### Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

- A. No comments were received from neighborhood groups or adjacent property owners; however, several comments were received from outside agencies. Please see the comments attached at the end of this letter.
  - *Response: Noted, comments reviewed.*

#### Completeness and Clarity of the Application

*Applicable to All Master Plan Tabs*

- A. Certain design standards may be deferred to the first Site Plan. We are anticipating that site plan may be for a gas station or similar developer. Also, a key idea with a master plan is to help clarify expectations for both future developers and staff moving forward.

We are very concerned that it is not a realistic expectation for the developer of a gas station or similar small commercial building to have the expertise or reasonable expectation of putting together urban design standards for an entire master plan that also involve the required design concepts in this zone district.

Key MU-R requirements in the MU-R zone district need to be included with the initial master plan proposal. Many of these requirements are located in the description of the zoning district UDO Section 2.4.7 and need to be identified on all of the Master Plan Maps. In addition to identifying the locations of these features on the various maps, please describe how these features will be implemented with your project, including:

- i. design principles/guidelines and standards for each feature;
- ii. conceptual photos or renderings that illustrate the intent;
- iii. an implementation strategy identifying when these features developed. The implementation approach should be included with the feature descriptions on the land use plan and in the PIP as appropriate. Your design approach should meet or exceed the requirements associated with each of the features.

MUR features and descriptions that need to be included on your next submitted include:

- i. Focal Point;
  - ii. intersection plazas;
  - iii. walkable main street;
  - iv. High Visibility Sites; and
  - v. boundary roads.
- *Response: Noted, the expectation of a gas station on this site will be detailed and discussed with the forthcoming site plan. Consistent with the City zoning code and area, a gas station is a permitted use on this site. The above noted Key requirements have been incorporated into the resubmitted Master Plan.*

We recommend meeting with Planning Staff prior to your next submittal to identify approaches to these issues.

- B. In all instances, please change “FDP” or “Framework Development Plan” to “Master Plan”.
  - *Response: Completed.*
- C. Remove the prompting language from the Master Plan Manual and only include the responses.
  - *Response: Completed.*
- D. Modify “Waivers” to “Adjustments”.
  - *Response: Completed.*
- E. The “Walkable Main Street” must be shown continuing north and connecting to the E. 5th Avenue alignment on all applicable tabs. Please see the redlines for details.
  - *Response: Walkable Main Street updated in Tabs 7, 8, 9, and 10.*

*Tab 3 – Context Map*

- F. Label the subject site and identify the zoning within the boundaries (MU-R).
  - *Response: Completed.*

- G. Show and label the rights-of-way or reduce the opacity of the underlying zone districts to provide site context.
  - *Response: We reduced the opacity of the underlying zone districts to reveal site context.*
- H. Nearby developments should be labeled. Please see the redlines for the labeled nearby developments or communities.
  - *Response: Nearby developments and communities have been labeled.*

#### Tab 4 – Natural Features Maps

- I. Please provide the contour detail for the northern property. If there are other high points, ridge lines, or view corridors within this property, please label these as well.
  - *Response: Northern contour lines have been provided. No additional ridge lines or view corridors have been identified.*
- J. If the view corridors are to be retained, please expand on them in the narrative in this tab. The language should be added to include height restrictions or building placement if the intent is to keep the view corridors facing the mountains.
  - *Response: Southern view corridors have been expanded upon within the Narrative.*
- K. Are there proposed noise mitigation measures for the multifamily adjacent to E-470 and within the Buckley Air Force Base Influence District? If these are proposed, please identify them in item 5 within this tab.
  - *Response: Note has been provided on Natural Features Map. Project Site is located within the Airport Influence Area of the Buckley Air Force Base.*

#### Tab 6 – Master Plan Narrative

- L. Provide information in item 13 on this tab as the application moves forward. This application was referred to several outside agencies, several of which provided questions, comments, or concerns. These have been included at the end of this letter. Please include any discussions, conclusions, or agreements made with any of those entities in this section of the narrative.
  - *Response: Added outside agencies to Item 13 within the Narrative.*

#### Tab 8 – Land Use Map and Matrix

- M. Remove “E-470 Regional Activity Center” as it does not exist in the UDO.
  - *Response: Completed.*

#### Tab 9 – Open Space, Circulation and Neighborhood Plan

- N. Elements from Tab 8 must be shown on this tab. Please include the focal point, walkable main street, boundary road, and high-visibility sites.
  - *Response: Focal point, walkable main street, boundary road, and high visibility sites added.*
- O. Include all Planning Areas and acreages within this tab as shown in Tab 8.
  - *Response: Completed.*

## 1. Zoning and Land Use Comments

#### Tab 7 – Public Art Plan

- A. This tab is being reviewed by Roberta Bloom in the Library and Cultural Services Department. She will provide forthcoming comments as it relates to this tab.
  - *Response: Acknowledged.*

#### Tab 8 – Land Use Map and Matrix

- B. Identify which Planning Areas (or pieces of Planning Areas) shall be designated as high-visibility sites per the requirements of the MU-R District. The UDO definition for high-visibility sites is:  
*As used in the MU-R zone district regulations, the single row of building sites located between the E-470 right-of-way and the Boundary Road.*
  - *Response: High visibility sites designated in Land Use Map.*
  
- C. The focal point proposed does not meet the definition for focal point:  
*As used for MU-R zone district, a point that serves as the center of the area with the highest development density or the most intense activity in the MU-R zone district. If the property abuts the E-470 right-of-way, the focal point shall include a distinctively designed building or feature that is visible from E-470 and that is immediately adjacent to the Walkable Main Street element. The Focal Point shall be connected to the Main Street (as defined in this Article 146-6), and may be located within a High Visibility Site (as defined in this Article 146-6). The tallest buildings and the buildings with the highest development density within the MU-R zone district shall be located on Focal Point Sites, which shall include all of the land within 660 feet of the Focal Point, and which may also (at the applicant's option) include any additional land located within 660 feet of the Main Street.*  
The plaza proposed at the corner of E. 6th Pkwy and N. Gun Club Rd complies with another requirement within the MU-R District for a “public plaza or outdoor meeting area” per Section 146-2.4.7.E.2 (Page 57 of the UDO). Focal points are typically internal to the site and, as the definition alludes, the area within the Master Plan that contains the most development density and intensity. It may be helpful to conceptualize this requirement by providing additional details within this tab for the type of development anticipated for this focal point area.
  - *Response: Focal Point has been moved to PA-5 along the walkable Main Street.*
  
- D. Please note that vehicle related uses (gas stations) shall not be permitted on focal point sites, lots adjacent to walkable main streets, or high-visibility sites.
  - *Response: Focal Point has been moved to PA-5 along the walkable Main Street.*
  
- E. Additional details including development triggers, improvement details, etc. need to be included in Form D based on Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan. Please see the redlines on that tab for details.
  - *Response: Noted, redlines on plans provided have been reviewed and addressed. Form D has referenced the PIP for details. A supplementary document has been provided for the PIP narrative with triggers.*
  
- F. Identify the boundary road per the requirements of the MU-R District. This boundary road must also be identified in Tab 9.
  - *Response: Completed.*

2. Access, Connectivity and Improvements

**Tab 6 Master Plan Narrative**

- A. Please expand upon the vehicular and pedestrian circulation as it relates to the north/south “walkable main street”. Include language that indicates that it will align with the proposed access to the south across E. 6th Pkwy and connect to E. 5th Ave to the north.
  - *Response: Language added to Narrative expanded on vehicular and pedestrian circulation.*

**Tab 8 – Land Use Map and Matrix**

- B. The “Walkable Main Street” must be shown continuing north and connecting to the E. 5th Avenue alignment. Please see the redlines for details.
  - *Response: Completed.*

- C. Add the turning movement at the E. 5th Avenue intersection per Traffic Engineering redlines on Tab 9.
  - *Response: Noted, turning movements will be prepared and submitted at the time of the site-specific site plan phase of the project.*
- D. Modify the remaining turning movements per Traffic Engineering redlines on Tab 9. These should be consistent throughout all tabs.
  - *Response: Turning movements have been updated on Tabs 8 and 9.*

**Tab 9 – Open Space, Circulation and Neighborhood Plan**

- E. Show the main street continuing to connect to E. 5th Ave.
  - *Response: Completed.*
- F. Show and label the boundary road per comment 3F.
  - *Response: Completed.*
- G. Future access must be shown and labeled for the site to the north. This access also must be discussed in Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan.
  - *Response: Future Access labeled on Tab 9.*
- H. Pedestrian circulation must also be shown on this tab. Please add a new line type/color to the legend to illustrate pedestrian circulation throughout the Master Plan.
  - *Response: Pedestrian circulation added to legend on Tab 9.*
- I. Please note Planning Comments in the TIS that have been coordinated with Public Works relating to the inclusion of a 5th Avenue extension and access to 5th Avenue from the Multifamily PA.
  - *Response: Understood.*

**Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan**

- J. The focal point, boundary street, high-visibility sites, and walkable main street need to be identified on all sheets within the PIP. Development triggers for each need to be discussed in the narrative.
  - *Response: focal points and street types have been shown on all plans and a supplementary document has been provided outlining the development triggers for each PA.*
- K. Reconfigured the shown boundary street as a Main Street per the comments on Tab 8 and 9.
  - *Response: Completed.*
- L. Development triggers need to be provided for the improvements both on- and off-site. These should be included in the narrative as discussed in the comments from Civil Engineering.
  - *Response: Noted and included in the PIP narrative.*
- M. For each planning areas please identify what infrastructure and development features need to be complete in order for any development in that planning area to occur. In this sense each improvement for each planning area are described in somewhat of a vacuum without making assumptions about any anticipated sequential “phasing”. Please describe these ideas in a narrative for each planning area in addition to the illustrative map. Ideas often included are discussion of looped water, utilities, and two points of access as well as specific development features such as plazas and focal points.
  - *Response: Noted and provided in the supplementary narrative document.*
- N. Show and label the boundary road adjacent to E-470 on all other Master Plan tabs.
  - *Response: Completed.*

- O. Information similar to what is shown for PA-5 needs to be discussed for the other Planning Areas. The exact location for the utility connections does not need to be shown, but what utilities are being pulled into the PA and from where need to be identified within the narrative.
  - *Response: Noted and provided in the UTILITIES section of the PIP Narrative provided.*

3. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

- A. NOTE: Architectural and Urban Design elements will be required at the time of submission of the first site plan, preliminary plat, and/or final plat within this development to be reviewed as a Master Plan Amendment.
  - *Response: Architectural and Urban Design Pages included for Second Submittal.*

4. Signage Issues

*Tab 10 - Signage*

- A. If there are any joint tenant monument signs proposed, please include another symbol in the legend and locate them on the plan.
  - *Response: Completed.*
- B. Generally, the signage shown on the Master Plan should be for the whole development area (i.e. joint tenant signage, center signage, wayfinding, etc.). Individual tenant signs and monument signs for pad sites will be reviewed on a site-by-site basis.
  - *Response: Acknowledged.*
- C. Include design elements within Form F-1 for these urban design features that create a unique design or a theme for the development. City of Aurora standards are the minimum, but it is expected that a design theme or defining characteristic for the overall development is provided. Simply stating, "This Urban Design feature shall comply with this FDP (\*Master Plan) and if not mentioned, the applicable zoning code in effect for the time of site plan submittal shall govern" for all urban design features is not acceptable. Provide additional detail for these items to inform the overall design theme of the development.
  - *Response: Elements added to Tab 10.*
- D. To illustrate the features in item 6C, provide photographic or diagrammatic examples. These examples should be labeled and referenced in Form F-1 where applicable.
  - *Response: Elements added to Tab 10.*

5. Landscaping Issues

(Kelly Bish / 303-739-7189 / kbish@auroragov.org / Comments in bright teal/black text)

*Tab 11 – Landscape Design Guidelines*

- A. Generally, the standards provided are not clearly defined. Please see the redlines within Tab 11 for details.
  - *Response: The landscape standards matrix has been updated to show plant quantities required for each code section and tabs have been added to clearly define design guidelines for the master plan.*
- B. Has approval been obtained from the E-470 Authority to landscape within the Multi-Use Easement?
  - *Response: Not yet, coordination with the E470 authority is ongoing. We have reached out to Peggy directly and are waiting for a response back.*

- C. Actual design standards must be provided including plant quantities and any special treatments to mitigate the presence of E-470 to adjacent land uses. Please elaborate on these in item 3 of Form G.
  - *Response: The landscape buffer is proposed to be provided within the E-470 easement. The landscape that will be required will meet the code from section 4.7.5 H of the UDO code.*
- D. Street trees are a separate requirement from buffers. They are not to be used to meet buffer requirements.
  - *Response: Streetscapes and landscape buffers have been divided out in the landscape matrix and design standards tabs have been added, see 11.07 and 11.08.*
- E. The Master Plan should explicitly state that all development will comply with the landscape standards in affect at the time of site plan submittal. In addition, existing code standards or specific code sections should not be replicated here. The current code represents the basic landscape standards to be met. Any proposed changes to the current UDO such as enhanced standards that will exceed or go above and beyond current code should be addressed here. Design principles/guidelines and standards should be provided for each unique circumstance. The landscape standards should include photos and/or renderings and maps that illustrate intents.
  - *Response: The landscape standards matrix has been updated to show plant quantities required for each code section and tabs have been added to clearly define design guidelines for the master plan.*
- F. Unique elements and/or circumstances might include theming, plaza's and accompanying accoutrements such as seat walls, raised planters and tree cut outs. Buffers adjacent to easements. How will the site entries be designed? How will landscaping refine any proposed monumentation? Will there be formal tree lined streets or informal? Will detention ponds be designed and landscaped to be an amenity? Are any adjustments (formerly waivers) being requested? if so, how are those being mitigated?
  - *Response: Imagery and design language has been added to create the vision for the different landscape standards. Plant quantities and details have been added to the landscape matrix for more definition to these requirements.*
- G. I believe the "Gardens and Parkside Neighborhoods" are from Painted Prairie.
  - *Response: These couple of plants have been removed from the plant list.*

## 6. Addressing

(Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / pturner@auroragov.org)

- A. Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for GIS mapping purposes. Include the parcel, street line, easement and building footprint layers at a minimum. Please ensure that the digital file provided in a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Please contact me if you need additional information about this digital file.
  - *Response: Noted, a CAD file will be provided as requested once the proposed improvements are generally accepted by the City.*

## REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Civil Engineering

(Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / KTanabe@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

**Tab 10 – Signage**

- A. Street lights along the public right-of-way will be owned and maintained by the City of Aurora and meet COA standards. Please add language to section 4 in Form F-1 to demonstrate this.

- *Response: Language has been added to Form F-1.*

**Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan**

- B. As previously explained, a narrative is required to accompany the exhibits detailing the improvements that are required for each Planning Area. The Multi-Use Easement and detention facilities are not Planning Areas to be developed, but supplemental areas to the development. An exhibit with the full build out is typically the first exhibit.

- *Response: Narrative provided as requested*

- C. The Master Plan will not be approved by Public Works prior to the approval of the Master Drainage study.

- *Response: Noted, we are working with engineering, MHFD and SEMSWA on the MDP.*

- D. Please make sure that only the improvements REQUIRED for each development are shown and included in the narrative. I don't believe whatever is happening in the MUE requires all the utilities to be shown. This applies to all other exhibits as well. Internal storm and sanitary sewer of PA-5 are not required in PA-2 or PA-3 for example.

- *Response: Noted, required improvements for each PA revised.*

- E. No parking in the Main Street? There is a Main Street section in the Roadway Manual for an Urban Center that would be a good guideline (S1.12).

- *Response: Bike lane removed from this section and replaced with parallel parking. We felt that the existing bike access to this area was very limited thus providing bike lanes internal to the site did not seem needed. The section has been modeled after the S1.12 detail as recommended with 11ft lanes and wider sidewalks to achieve the pedestrian activated area*

- F. A 7' minimum bike lane width is required. Please revise the section.

- *Response: Noted, bike lane width revised.*

- G. 10' travel lanes are very narrow for a commercial center.

- *Response: Noted, the travel lane width has been revised.*

- H. Detached sidewalks are preferable for pedestrian safety.

- *Response: Noted, sections have been revised for detached walks where applicable.*

- I. Include a section for E. 6th Pkwy.

- *Response: Section included.*

- J. Why is the boundary street shown in the redlines not included?

- *Response: boundary street added.*

- K. All of the internal drives will be constructed with PA-2?

- *Response: Internal drives revised*

- L. Indicate which intersections have been identified as potential (or existing) traffic signals in the Master Traffic Study.

- *Response: The existing signalized intersection of 6<sup>th</sup> Parkway and Gun Club Road is the only intersection identified to be signalized during the short-term and long-term horizons in the master traffic study.*

- M. The internal utilities shown on the redlines will be constructed with PA-2?
  - *Response: No, these have been removed as applicable. All mainline utilities will need to be constructed with any development to provide storm, sanitary and water to all PAs.*
- N. The completion of the north half of E. 6th Pkwy is required with any development within this Master Plan as well as the N. Gun Club Rd improvements along the full frontage, not just the southern parcel. This was indicated in the Pre-App Notes due to the development in the area. Please modify all exhibits per this comment.
  - *Response: All ROW improvements included in all PAs, though please note that at the time of the future development, the properties may be under separate ownership and ROW improvements will need to be discussed in further detail between developers.*
- O. Is the drive shown on the redlines really needed for PA-3?
  - *Response: Revised.*
- P. The section for the boundary street is not included. Please provide the section in the 2nd submission.
  - *Response: Section included.*
- Q. Please do not have a separate exhibit for the detention ponds. They will not be constructed on their own, but in support of the other Planning Areas.
  - *Response: Separate exhibit removed from Set*
- R. A connection to E. 5th Avenue and an extension of the main street have been discussed.
  - *Response: Extension of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue has been provided.*
- S. Utilities need to be shown in PA-9. At a minimum, they need to be shown in the streets.
  - *Response: Utilities have been shown in PA-9 (now noted as PA-10).*
- T. Is the drive shown in the redlines really needed for PA-9?
  - *Response: Revised*
- U. Are sidewalks going to be provided for the boundary road section?
  - *Response: The boundary road section is generally going to consist of head in parking. A developer may choose to provide sidewalks in place of parking if desired.*

7. Traffic Engineering

(Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / bmedema@auroragov.org / Comments in amber)

**Traffic Impact Study Comments**

- A. Include the volumes shown on the redlines on the eastern side of E. 5th Ave.
  - *Response: Thank you for providing the traffic assignment for the development to the east. These traffic assignment volumes have been included in both horizons in the revised traffic study.*
- B. Master Traffic Impact Studies also need a figure showing the classification of the internal roadways. Based on connectivity, the roadway connecting 5th Ave to 6th Pkwy appears to meet the collector classification. Include ADT on each internal roadway.
  - *Response: The total traffic Figures 9 and 10 display the estimated ADT volumes for the internal street network in the revised traffic study. Further, the recommended lane configurations and control Figures 11 and 12 show the expected roadway classifications of the internal roadways.*

- C. Revisit the calculations for axillary storage lengths. Aurora uses CDOT’s SHAC requirements for determining length. Note that as both Gun Club Rd and 6th/Hogan Pkwy are 45mph in the sections adjacent to this development and per SHAC turn lanes requires decel length in addition to taper.
  - *Response: The CDOT Access Code has been utilized for design length in addition to the need for turn lanes in the revised study. Further, the segments with speeds limits greater than 40 MPH have been evaluated.*
  
- D. TIS guidelines calls for individual movements of unsignalized intersections to be LOS D or better. If a movement falls to LOS E, propose mitigation or justify the degradation by offering a suitable alternative to the movement if there is sufficiently little traffic. Note that LOS F for individual movements is unacceptable and shall be mitigated/discussed.
  - *Response: All movement LOS E have been mitigated or justified in the revised study. Most of the movement LOS E reported previously became LOS D or better due to the additional full access provided at 5th Avenue and with less residential units being used for the north parcels (previously evaluated as background traffic with more units) in the revised study. Further, the signal timing splits were slightly modified to mitigate LOS E movements at the 6th Parkway and Gun Club Road intersection.*
  
- E. Add individual movements to table 6.
  - *Response: Individual movements have been included in Table 6 of the revised traffic study.*
  
- F. See the other comments throughout the traffic impact study.
  - *Response: Individual responses are also provided throughout the text box comment response document.*

**Tab 9 – Open Space, Circulation and Neighborhood Plan**

- G. Add the connection to E. 5th Ave and identify it as a full movement intersection and a potential future signalized intersection. Label the other access points per the redlined comments. These accesses must be also shown on Tab 8.
  - *Response: Access points labels as requested. Please note that per the traffic study, no additional future signalized intersection are anticipated and thus have not been labeled as such.*

**8. Fire / Life Safety**

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

**Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan**

- A. Provide additional information regarding the connection to E. 5th Ave.
  - *Response: Connection to 5<sup>th</sup> Ave shown on PIP plans and section for roadway added to plans.*
  
- B. The developer is responsible for the construction of all on-site and off-site infrastructure needed including fire hydrants. Adequate fire hydrant coverage shall consist of fire hydrants placed on average 500’ on each side of the street and arranged in an alternating basis.
  - *Response: Noted, the details/locations for the site hydrants will be included with the Site Plans for the development.*
  
- C. Provide additional details regarding the boundary streets. See private street comments about width and fire lane easement requirements.
  - *Response: Noted, section has been revised and note has been added to PIPs that any access drives less than 23ft in width may require a dedicated fire access easement.*

- D. Depending on the adjacent parking, conditions, and width of the road, a larger outside turning radius may be required. This configuration must be able to support Fire Apparatus turning movement with width requirements. A turning template will be required showing that the Fire Apparatus can travel through the roads without travelling onto or over the sidewalks and curbs.
  - *Response: Noted, fire truck turning templates shall be provided at the formal site plan phase of the individual developments.*
- E. Will the Private Drives be constructed to a COA Standard? Typically, private streets that are constructed to the COA street standards do not require a fire lane easement dedication. Private streets that do not meet a roadway standard may require a fire lane easement of a minimum width of 23' (or a 26' when required by Appendix D of the 2015 IFC) will be required if the private drives are not constructed to a COA standard.
  - *Response: Noted, section has been revised and note has been added to PIPs that any access drives less than 23ft in width may require a dedicated fire access easement.*

9. Aurora Water

(Ryan Tigera / 303-326-8867 / rtigera@auroragov.org / Comments in red)

- A. Are the 6-inch stubs for private service lines to each basin?
  - *Response: Yes, the water stubs are provided for each lot/basin to minimize the need to cut back into the new roadway for service at the time of development.*
- B. Clarify if C within Table 5 is defined as a park. If so, size the demand per 5.02.3.
  - *Response: Basin C is not a park, but an open space. The only water lines to service this area will be irrigation lines. Because of this, a demand has not been included/calculated for this basin.*
- C. Expand on why 1,250 gpm was chosen for the scenario shown in the redlines.
  - *Response: This was originally for a split between hydrants. The report and waterCAD model have been changed to evaluate a fire flow of 2500 gpm at each hydrant.*
- D. Does Basin G need two points of connection based on the fire flow results? Please confirm the correct fire flow demands per Aurora Water Criteria.
  - *Response: It is assumed that only one point of connection is needed for basin G based on average demands for a commercial site of this size. According to the waterCAD model used, there is still a fire flow available of 2500 gpm.*
- E. The sanitary main connection should be coordinated with the development to the south. Please contact Garrett Graham at garrettg@pcsgroupco.com for details.
  - *Response: Noted, the sanitary sewer connection proposed is based on the approved plan set for the southern development. Coordination with the adjacent developer/engineer will be forthcoming.*
- F. Table 4 on sheet 6 indicates 2,500 gpm demand per Aurora Water Criteria. Please clarify based on the redlines on sheet 23.
  - *Response: The demand for the hydrants has been changed to reflect an available fire flow of 2500 gpm at each hydrant, rather than being distributed across both hydrants. This is shown in the fire flow report and not in the hydrant table.*

10. PROS

(Curtis Bish / 303-739-7178 / cbish@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

- A. Project Characterization

The following information has relevance to the determination of PROS' requirements for this project. Because your proposal includes two multi-family planning areas, the influx of new residents will impact the parks and open space system. This impact shall be mitigated in accordance with City Code.

- *Response: Noted.*

**B. Population Impact**

The submittal does not clearly state how many units are proposed. In your second submittal, set forth a total unit count for purposes of calculating PROS' land dedication and park development fee requirements. A projected population for your project will be based on the total unit count multiplied by an average household size of 2.5 persons per unit.

- *Response: See Form D for details regarding dwelling units and densities.*

**C. Land Dedication**

To ensure that adequate park land and open space areas are available to meet the needs of the population introduced into the city by the new dwelling units, City Code specifies that land shall either be dedicated on-site within the project's limits or a cash payment in-lieu of land dedication shall be paid. The required dedication acreage shall be computed by applying the following standards to the projected population for the project:

- 3.0 acres for neighborhood park purposes per 1,000 persons
- acres for community park purposes per 1,000 persons
- 7.8 acres for open space purposes per 1,000 persons

Please coordinate with PROS staff before resubmittal to discuss land dedication criteria and options.

- Cash-in-Lieu of Land Dedication Payment

Any required acreage which is not dedicated on-site shall be multiplied by an estimated market value for the property. Market value will be based on land within the subdivision as fully developed, with all attendant infrastructure, in accordance with the land uses approved for the subdivision. The cash-in-lieu amount shall be paid prior to recordation of the subdivision plat.

- *Response: Noted, per the response below, this will be coordinated with PROS throughout the Site Plan phase that is forthcoming.*

**D. Park Development Fees**

Park Development Fees shall be collected by the city to cover the cost of constructing new park facilities which are not provided on-site to serve the needs of the new residents. The fee amount will be dependent on how much, if any, improved park land is provided. Determinations cannot be made until more information is known about this project's park development intentions. Please coordinate with PROS staff to further discuss before the second submittal. The fees, which are computed and collected on a per-unit basis, shall be paid at time of building permit issuance.

- *Response: The proposed open space area at the corner of Gun Club and 6<sup>th</sup> parkway is not proposed to be a public dedicated park as discussed with the City at the pre-app meeting, as the City did not want ownership. Further coordination with PROS will be ongoing throughout the Site Plan and CD process for the site.*

**E. Forms J & D**

Land dedication requirements and the proposed method of how they will be satisfied should be explicitly presented in Form J to be added to Tab 9. Additionally, lines 2 and 21 through 24 of Form D should be amended to indicate the intent to provide on-site park and open space acreage, if applicable.

- *Response: Form J has been added to the 2<sup>nd</sup> submittal. Form has been revised accordingly.*

- F. Tab 9 – Open Space, Circulation & Neighborhood Map  
Connectivity through the site and to access points along adjacent properties should be provided for pedestrians and bicyclists. Show the alignment of trails and other connections to destinations, including the plaza. Additionally, this map should be amended to indicate the intent to provide on-site land dedication acreage, if applicable.
- *Response: Alignment of trails and other connections will be provided in the CSP.*

- G. Tab 13 - Public Improvements Plan  
Include the implementation phasing for park land and open space development, if applicable.
- *Response: The open space in PA-8 will be developed with PA-6 as outlined in the PIP narrative. Open space and other parks required due to the multi-family developments will be the responsibility of the MF Developer.*

11. Arapahoe County Public Works and Development  
(Sarah White / 720-874-6541 / swhite@arapahoegov.com)

- A. Main Street is proposed to ingress/egress at 6th Parkway and is close in proximity to the 470 on ramp. As per the TIS, this should be a right-in-right-out. Please ensure there is a physical barrier along 6th to prohibit left in- left out and include accel/decel lanes for the development to ensure better traffic flow along 6th and the E-470 interchange.
- *Response: Noted, a RI/RO access notation has been added to this access point. A porkchop design will be included with the formal site plan phase of the development.*
- B. Also consider the placement of an eventual designated turn lane for the 470 on-ramp.
- *Response: Noted, the sidewalk along 6<sup>th</sup> Parkway has been located along the property line where possible to reduce reconstruction at the time of the future on-ramp reconfiguration. Due to grades and connection to the existing, the walk will 'snake' along the property line in the interim condition.*

12. Arapahoe County Planning Division  
(Terri Maulik / 720-874-6650 / referrals@arapahoegov.com)

- A. The Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan identifies the property north of the proposed development as Regional Commercial. The proposed mix of multi-family and commercial appears compatible with the Arapahoe County Comprehensive Plan.
- *Response: Noted, thank you.*

13. Mile High Flood District  
(Morgan Lynch / mlynch@udfcd.com)

- A. See the attached comment letter. This project is not maintenance eligible, but we still have courtesy comments that should be considered.
- *Response: noted, thank you!*

14. E-470 Authority  
(Chuck Weiss / 303-537-3420 / cweiss@e-470.com)

- A. At this time E-470 Public Highway Authority has the following comments:
- Occupying space for utility work, access, and any construction within the E-470 ROW and MUE (multi-use easement) is subject to and will be in compliance with the E-470 Public Highway Authority Permit Manual, April 2008, as may be amended from time to time (the

“Permit Manual”) and will require an E-470 Construction or Access Permit. The administration fee is \$750.00 and \$75,000 per acre for construction.

- *Response: Noted.*
- A permit will be required from E-470 for any encroachment or disturbance to E-470 ROW or MUE prior to construction.
  - *Response: Noted.*
- E-470 does not recommend residential uses adjacent to the highway.
  - *Response: Noted.*
- E-470 is not responsible for noise mitigation.
  - *Response: Noted.*
- Development plans and construction plans should provide appropriate noise mitigation measures.
  - *Response: Noted.*
- Clearly label the ROW and MUE on the appropriate sheets, please see attached ownership map.
  - *Response: Noted and labels provided*
- Stormwater discharge to the E-470 ROW will need to be treated prior to release and will be limited to historic rates tributary to E-470.
  - *Response: Noted, coordination emails have been sent to Peggy Davenport for stormwater approach.*
- Permit will need to address long term maintenance for improvements constructed in E-470 ROW including landscaping, detention pond outfall and emergency overflow sections.
  - *Response: Noted, permits will be submitted as applicable with the Site Plans and CDs phase of the project.*
- E-470 TBMS (fiber) is located along the eastern ROW fence line. This line is to be protected in place.
  - *Response: noted.*
- The RI/RO along 6th Parkway will need to be spaced a minimum of 660’ from the NB E-470 ramps.
  - *Response: Noted, it is estimated that just under 700-ft has been provided between the access point and the existing on-ramp location.*
- A comment/response document would be helpful to track the revisions to each submittal.
  - *Response: Provided.*
- Additional comments will be issued as design progresses.
  - *Response: Noted.*

**MILE HIGH FLOOD DISTRICT  
MAINTENANCE ELIGIBILITY PROGRAM (MEP)  
MHFD Referral Review Comments  
(Morgan Lynch, P.E., CFM Project Manager, Watershed Services)**

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: Not applicable

While there are no maintenance eligible features associated with this project, we do have the following courtesy comments to offer:

1. This site lies within subbasin 139 of the 2013 Sand Creek MDP. This subbasin, and the upstream basin to its north, subbasin 138, are shown to flow east under E470 through a culvert. Based on the plans provided with this referral, the southern portion of the site is directed to a detention pond in the southwest corner of the site, which is then routed to an existing storm sewer to the south. The District recommends that this projects flows maintain their existing flow to the west.
  - *Response: Our proposed drainage approach for the southern pond has been further evaluated through coordination with MHFD and the City. Per our coordination the City and MHFD can support our approach and additional analysis/discussion has been provided in our MDP for review.*
2. Two developments adjacent to this development are also currently in the planning phase: Aurora One to the west (across E-470) and Harmony Commercial to the south (across 6th Parkway). Aurora One is anticipating to receive flows from the Lamar Landing project site via the existing culvert under E-470, and is prepared to accommodate those flows. Harmony Commercial is not anticipating to handle flows from the north.
  - *Response: Please refer to response provided in previous question.*
3. As a result of the above, the District recommends that this project maintain their existing flow routing to the west. This may require a change in alignment to the southwest detention pond's outfall.
  - *Response: Please refer to response provided in previous question.*

**XCEL ENERGY  
(Donna George, 303-571-3306 donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)**

1. Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the master plan for Lamar Landing. Please be aware PSCo owns and operates existing underground electric distribution facilities including a transformer along the southerly property line. The property owner/developer/contractor must complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities via [xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect](http://xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect). It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details. Additional easements may need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities.

For future planning and to ensure that adequate utility easements are available within this development, PSCo will be requesting minimum 10-foot wide utility easements dedicated on private property abutting all public streets and around the perimeter of each commercial/industrial lot in the subdivision or platted area including tracts, parcels and/or open space areas.

- *Response: Noted. Dedicated easements will be coordinated with Xcel at the time of the Site Plan phase of the project.*

**CENTURY LINK**  
**(Don Davalos, (505)767-7449 Don.Davalos@CenturyLink.com)**

After review, CenturyLink has the following comments regarding the review request submitted:

1. It doesn't look like our facilities will be in conflict with this "site plan" with the screen shot of our data base, but please call locates and protect any of our plant in-place if found. See accompanying screenshot.
  - *Response: Noted, thank you.*
2. Please note, the engineer that reviewed this information is Travis Young. If any changes should need to be made, please contact them at (303) 309-8951.
  - *Response: Noted.*

We appreciate your review and approval of these final plans. Please contact me at (303)228-2327 or [shelby.madrid@kimley-horn.com](mailto:shelby.madrid@kimley-horn.com) should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

KIMLEY-HORN AND ASSOCIATES, INC.



Shelby Madrid, P.E.  
Project Manager