

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



October 3, 2020

Geoffrey Babbitt
GB Capital, LLC
2993 S Peoria St Suite 105
Aurora, CO 80014

Re: Second Submission Review – Aurora One – Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment
Application Number: DA-2241-00
Case Numbers: 2020-2053-02, 2020-7004-00

Dear Mr. Babbitt:

Thank you for your second submission. We have reviewed it and attached our comments along with this cover letter. While significant improvement has been made, there are several issues which still remain. You will need to make another submission before the project can proceed to Planning Commission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before Wednesday, November 25, 2020. Your Planning Commission hearing date and City Council hearing dates will be estimated based off the submittal date of your third submittal.

Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a revised Tab 5 which specifically responds to each item and summarizes all changes made. 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 303-739-7112.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Chris Johnson".

Christopher Johnson, Planner II
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Julie Gamec, THK Associates Inc
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison
Jacob Cox, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\2241-00rev2.rtf



Second Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

- Comment headings 2-10 are made by your Planning Case Manager, all other comments come from the department representative labeled.
- Review all redline comments throughout all documents.
- Ensure code references are to the UDO or applicable regulations.
- Any proposed standards established by this Master Plan which do not exceed UDO standards must request and Adjustment.
- Revise neighborhood boundaries, descriptions, labels, and standards as requested.
- Address all Landscaping comments throughout. (see Item 12)
- Review and address all Public Works comments on the PIP (see Item 13)
- Traffic Engineering comments will be provided separately. (see Item 14)
- Coordinate directly with Aurora Water on the second review of the Master Utility Study (see Item 15)
- Make all required changes to the Form J and other documents as mentioned by PROS (see Item 16)
- Coordinate with outside referral agencies.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. Please review comments from outside referral agencies included at the end of this letter.

2. Tab 1 – Letter of Introduction

2A. Change the indicated wording in the description on page 3; Aurora One is located within the City of Aurora limits. East of Aurora is confusing.

3. Tab 3 – Context Map

3A. The neighborhood boundaries are shown in the legend, but do not appear on the map for the area within Aurora One. Or is the intent for the red dashed symbol to show the boundaries of the existing adjacent neighborhoods and developments, such as Horizon Uptown? Please clarify this. The proposed neighborhoods within Aurora One don't necessarily need to be shown here at this level, so only one symbol to illustrate existing nearby neighborhoods will suffice.

3B. Label the trail system along Coal Creek as well. Additionally, there is a comment from the PROS department in another tab concerning the alignment of this regional trail system. If there is an error in the alignment shown which you correct, be sure the change is reflected properly on all maps.

4. Tab 4 – Site Analysis Narrative

4A. There appear to be two different line types showing what I assume are topo lines (perhaps existing versus proposed?). Please clarify these in the legend and show only one symbol for existing topography.

5. Tab 6 – Master Plan Narrative

5A. There should be 7 neighborhoods based on the other documents. A detailed description of Hogan Village is missing from the narrative.

5B. The wording in Hogan Crossings, and in several places throughout the master plan and urban design standards, is a bit ambiguous and worrisome given the context of the larger project and the MU-R zoning. The approach of crafting a specific area of Aurora One, Hogan Landings, to be the center of auto-oriented development is supported by staff. This is a creative approach to respond to the project's unique challenges, and to blend the need to meet market demand for convenience and vehicle-centric commercial development and the convenient location adjacent to E-470



with the vision of MU-R to create an intensive and urban environment. However, the goal should be to limit the development of these types of vehicle centric uses throughout the entire master plan and the wording used in Hogan Crossings of “vehicular oriented” language seems to be making the vision of this area too similar to that of Hogan Landings. The preference would be to craft the language for Hogan Crossings in a slightly different tone: not to outright prohibit or discourage “vehicular oriented” uses, but to not necessarily encourage their widespread development either. Please feel free to contact your case planner for further discussion on fleshing out this topic.

6. Tab 9 – Open Space, Circulation, & Neighborhood Plan

6A. The map in this document came out very pixelated and is not legible. The version of this map included in the “Master Plan Maps” PDF was fine, ensure that the map in Tab 9 is updated to match.

7. Tab 10 – Urban Design Standards

General Comment for Tabs 10, 11, and 12: There are several instances throughout these tabs where there are inconsistencies between this Master Plan and the UDO. While the Master plan is allowed to develop unique standards for development, those standards must be of equal or higher quality if they are going to explicitly contradict a standard of the UDO. Please ensure that this is occurring throughout the Master Plan. In areas where there is going to be an explicit contradiction between the standards detailed in this Master Plan and those detailed in the UDO, be sure to provide language stating which document will hold authority (i.e. “In instances where these standards conflict with the City of Aurora’s adopted zoning ordinance, the stricter standard shall apply” or similar). If there are specific standards which you wish to establish that are less restrictive than those required in the UDO, those must be addressed by an adjustment request which would be reviewed by the Planning Commission. Please consider this when reviewing the comments on these Tabs and in addressing your revisions.

7A. The neighborhood numbering is off, it labels both Village Hills and Hogan Landings as neighborhood 6. This occurs on a couple maps throughout, be sure to correct this on all maps.

7B. The Village Towers neighborhood is not using the Multi-family color from the legend. Additionally, based on the legend no Community Park’s are shown on the map.

7C. On the Urban Design Illustrative maps (pg. 126) considering shifting the boundary between Hogan Village and Hogan Landings to include the entirety of the Walkable Main Street within Hogan Village. Since these two neighborhoods have such different visions and standards, it is important to ensure that both sides of the Walkable Main Street are held to the same standard and see the same pattern of development.

7D. There is a typo on page 127, change “stories” to stores. There are also several typos of Valdai Street throughout.

7E. Consider adding language to the Hogan Village neighborhood that mentions minimum floor counts, vertical mix of uses, build to requirements, etc. to ensure this area truly encourages higher density and intensity of development.

7F. Similar to what was mentioned previously, the language in Hogan Crossings (pg. 128) should be altered slightly. Drive-throughs between the building and the street shouldn’t just be “discouraged”, they aren’t permitted by UDO standards. Add language to prioritize buildings lining Hogan Parkway, Picadilly Road, or 6th Avenue with parking to the side or rear. Individual site plans which cannot meet the drive-thru design standard can always request adjustments on a case by case basis, but this sort of language seems to open up contradictory direction from the UDO.

7G. Alter the language a bit in the Hogan Landings section/guiding principles (pg. 129). Mention of the main street should be reserved for Hogan Village. Additionally, the approach of Hogan’s Landing to be an area within Aurora One to concentrate vehicle oriented commercial development is smart, but it is still the “face of Aurora One” and therefore should be an area of auto-oriented uses with exceptional design and high standards for the layout and development of these uses so that it is a unique place.

7H. Village Hills (pg. 132) mentions a front-loaded garage being provided, but visuals and discussions to this point



have indicated the intent to provide alleys in this area. Pg. 188 of the Architectural Standards also specifically stated all homes shall be alley-loaded. Will there be a mix of alley and front loaded or all one or the other? Please clarify.

7I. The highway frontage zone (pg. 138) note 1 says “all types of development are permitted in the highway frontage zone”. This is a little ambiguous and could be used to argue for not permitted land uses in the future. Add language such as “all types of development permitted under the UDO are permitted”. Please also note that MU-R standards prohibit more than 50% of E-470 frontage area to be surface parking.

7J. Should the indicated commercial street be brought down all the way through Hogan Village for improved connectivity?

7K. The Walkable Mainstreet standards (pg. 144) should mention the MU-R Standards reference of build-to requirements and max building setbacks here to ensure subsequent development places buildings close to the street and parking behind structures. MU-R also prohibits any more than 15% of site frontage on main street to be surface parking, this should be repeated in urban design standards pg. 152.

7L. Structured Parking Design (pg. 155) should add a reference to the UDO requirements in section 146-4.6.5.E.

7M. For the multi-family parking standards (pg. 156), why add a unit count requirement to the parking standards? The UDO permits 1 space per unit, regardless of the number of bedrooms, to attempt to discourage excessive parking. This would make standards more demanding and development costlier for the high-density projects that should develop in Aurora One.

8. Tab 12 – Architectural Standards

8A. Pg. 180 – Typo, remove repetitive wording.

8B. Pg. 184- note 3 states that balconies may encroach over the Right of Way however the UDO requires prior written approval to be issued by the City. Please ensure this is mentioned in the standards.

8C. Consider adding a minimum floor count on pg. 185, or also adding a minimum parapet height requirement. Floor to ceiling could be difficult to review for at the site plan level. Standards requiring an urban feel, with taller buildings and a more enclosed feeling for the main street is very important for this area.

8D. These duplex standards appear to be far more relaxed than those in the UDO. For instance, the typical here showing a 30' wide lot for two duplexes would allow only 15' of lot width per unit, which means a maximum of a 10' wide home... this is very compact and will likely lead to issues with fitting home models on lots down the road. Consider this at the Master Plan level in the event that the current proposed builder changes over time. Standards need to allow the development of homes that can fit on site while still providing open space to residents and the ability for home models to meet all Fire and Building code separation requirements. Additionally, the preference specifically for establishing setbacks is that they follow the code, rather than deviate from it, so that review of site plans is consistent, and enforcement doesn't become difficult to manage years down the road as the area builds out.

8E. Note - there is a required 20-foot buffer for double fronted lots against an arterial, which is above the setback requirement.

8F. In the architectural features table (pg. 191) 5 points should not be allotted for providing an alley-loaded garage if this intended to be a base requirement anyway. Revise this scale.

8G. The wording of note 6 in the Residential Fence and Walls standards is confusing; is this a 10' rear yard fence setback requirement? Or is this intended to state that rear yard fences are placed no more than 10' away from the rear façade of the building? Please clarify



9. Master Plan Maps

General comment: make sure that any revisions made here also are made to the versions of these maps included in their respective tabs.

9A. Consider changing the labeling of PA 4 and PA 12 to just say SFA. Townhomes and Duplexes are specific and distinct land uses under the UDO, so referring to these at this level could effectively pigeon-hole you into only those land uses being allowed in these areas.

9B. The focal point is a very faint purple on the map, which doesn't match the legend and is also difficult to distinguish on the map.

9C. Ensure that any special paving features are permitted by PW Roadway Design and Construction Specifications.

9D. Suggestion: An approach in past Master Plans is to establish themes for various neighborhoods in signage and wayfinding to develop more distinct character. For example, airplanes for Hogan's Landing.

9E. There should be some form of park or open space provided for each neighborhood, with connectivity between them, to ensure compliance with the service radii. Consider how parks and open space are distributed through the master plan.

9F. The symbols used for circulation make it a bit difficult to discern what is supposed to be what when viewed on the map.

10. Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan

10A. Include metrics on parks space in the narrative portion.

10B. Rome will very likely become a heavily traveled connection as Horizon Uptown and Aurora One are built out. There is 80 ft of ROW here, so perhaps this should be contemplated as a 2-lane collector?

10C. Show trail connections to Coal Creek and E-470 systems, include trails shown on open space map, include trail sections as well. Ensure phasing addresses portions of trails which may be required to be built out in the various planning areas.

10D. The bike circulation doesn't seem to match the sections used. On street bike lanes are shown on 6th, Picadilly, Hogan, and the Central Two-lane collector, but the standard sections used don't illustrate this.

11. Transportation Planning Issues (Tom Worker-Braddock / 303-739-7340 / tworker@auroragov.org)

Tab 12 – Architectural Standards

11A. Address bike parking where applicable.

11B. Add references to bicycles in the access and connectivity standards.

11C. Pg. 205 - At least 10% of required bicycle parking spaces shall be located within 100' of primary building entrance.

Tab 13 – PIP

11D. Add bike lanes to Main Street typical, per NEATS (2018), Appendix I, Figure I-5, typical S1.12.

11E. Picadilly Road is designated as Primary Bike Route with Separated Bike Lanes in NEATS (2018). In NEATS, see Appendix I, Figure I-2, Typical S1.4.

11F. See comments on PIP Sheet 1 of 12. Address throughout.

Tab 14 – TIS

11G. Picadilly is designated as a Primary Bike Route with Separated Bike Lanes in NEATS (2018). Sand Creek Regional Greenway appears to be very near the study area.

11H. Picadilly Road, and 6th Avenue, are both designated in NEATS (2018) as future high frequency transit routes.

Master Plan Maps



11I. Make sure on-street bike lanes are reflected on roadway typical sections else ware in this application.

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

General Overall FDP Comment

- Be consistent throughout the document with how the title blocks for the larger sheets are being handled. Some have a colored bar across the bottom and designate TAB X: XX which is perfectly fine and then do not have the Tab called out in the corner with the title. But other sheets like the ones in the Master Plan, do not have this colored bar at the bottom and only call out which tab it is, in the corner of the sheets.
- Keep the numbering system consistent. Some sheets have both Sheet 5 of 6 and then a separate page number like 124 etc.
- Correct the spelling of Valdai. It is spelled in correctly as Valdi throughout Master Plan.
- Organize all the landscape requirements into TAB 11. Anything that discusses landscaping in TAB 10 Urban Design Standards, should be in TAB 11.
- Have one section on landscape buffers, one section on parking lot landscaping, one section on building perimeter landscaping etc., include as sub sections, any differences that may need to be defined that (A) above and beyond UDO minimums (B) have different standards that need to be defined specific to a given neighborhood. Do not repeat parking, buffers, street landscape requirements under each neighborhood.

TAB 8 Master Plan

Sheet 1

- Change the wording of waiver to adjustment.

Sheet 2

- The legend includes a designation for multi-family, but there is no color or area represented on the land use map.
- On Sheet 6, the Mixed Commercial Designation has been described as Village Towers a high-rise multi-family community. Is the description correct or is this Mixed Commercial designation correct?

Sheet 3

- Darken the font for the neighborhood names.
- Update the wording where indicated at the bottom of the matrix.
- The Urban Design Standards matrix should only occur in TAB 10 Urban Design Standards.

Sheet 4

- Provide the 25' buffer designation where indicated.
- The trail is not currently shown in its future location and needs to be revised as well as the 25' buffer that has been included. It may be removed.
- Make sure the 20' landscape buffer line work matches between the legend and the plan.
- Darken/shade in the focal point designation.

Sheet 5

- Update the title. Also make sure to add "Tab 9" to be consistent between the sheets. See comment above under General FDP comments.
- Because the land uses have been identified on a previous map/graphic - Sheet 2 of 6, ONLY clearly identify the boundaries of the neighborhoods. They can be outlined and shaded, but don't match the land use colors.
- There are (7) seven neighborhoods identified in the matrix, but six called out on the plan itself.
- Please put a black outline around the monument identifiers as they do not read well and get lost within the other colors.
- Darken the street names.
- Darken these neighborhood call outs/titles.
- If the thick red boundary represents Village Hills, then remove the line between the open space and the to be developed area. Again, represent each neighborhood as its own color and remove the land use categories from the map. Shift the label as well. Right now, the label for Village Hills is over the open space and yet the description discusses how it will be a high density attached development.
- Is this the Wayfinding Signage Plan or is page 159 in TAB 10 Urban Design Standards the Wayfinding Signage



Plan? It has more signage than this.

Sheet 6

- The landscape standards matrix appears three different times in the FDP. Here and twice in TAB 11. I believe it may only be needed in TAB 11 and just one time. Work with your Case Manager to determine the best and ultimate location.
- The architectural standards matrix appears several times throughout the FDP but would likely only need to be included once in TAB 12. Coordinate with your Case Manager.

TAB 11 Landscape Standards

Page 171

- Update the Form G Matrix per the comment provided.

Page 172

- Update the notes provided at the bottom of the Form G Matrix per the comment provided.

Landscape and Architectural Design Standards Sheet

- Is this sheet necessary? The landscape table provided repeats text provided elsewhere in the FDP document.
- If it is determined that this sheet should remain, then add TAB 11 in the corner. Be consistent with title blocks between tabs and documents within the FDP. The Master Plan Sheets, or TAB 9, does not have a colored bar across the bottom.
- The architectural table likely belongs on or within another Tab 12 within the FDP.

Page 173

- There are no true landscape standards in here. All the landscape information that has been provided under TAB 10 Urban Design needs to be placed in this tab.

Page 174

- At the beginning a definition/description of what the difference or intent of "Design Standards" vs. "Design Guidelines" should be provided. Typically, standards are required, and guidelines are prescriptive.
- The information relative to Parks and Open Spaces should be part of TAB 9.

Page 175

- There are no true xeric blue grass mixes. If considering Reville, Aurora Water and Planning does not consider that xeric as it is over watered due to its dormant nature to try and achieve the green look.
- The lighting statement for parks is contradictory.

TAB 10 Urban Design Standards

Page 120

- Update the wording at the bottom of the Form F-1 Matrix.

Page 124

- Form F-1 Matrix and page 124 are a repeat of information provided in the Master Plan document or TAB 8. Work with your Case Manager to determine whether both locations are necessary.
- Use only one page numbering system for the entire FDP document. See comment on plan sheet.

Page 125

- This sheet should be combined with the Signage sheet later in this section, page 57.
- If a determined to be a stand-alone sheet, then add "Sign" to the title.

Page 126

- Add the street names to the Key Map of the Aurora Neighborhoods.
- Make sure the plan title is large and matches the other sheets in the Master Plan.

Page 134

- "All Streets" This means that every street in the entire development is intended to be urban. That is 16' sidewalk with tree openings or tree grates. The PIP does not show this. Several road cross sections are different. Will there be no detached sidewalks with curbside landscapes i.e. sod or shrub beds? Indicate cross sections through a graphic as to where these cross sections are taken.



- Update the cross section provided to replace the existing verbiage of throughway zone with sidewalk and furnishing zone with curbside landscape.

Page 125

- Some of the information being provided is repetitive and only needs to be included once.
- Anything dealing with landscaping, should be in TAB 11, not the urban design section. There may be a portion of the development that utilizes tree grates or tree openings etc., but again, that should be in TAB 11.
- Native seeding is being proposed with Stephen D. Hogan Parkway, but where? The cross section provided indicates an urban condition.

Page 137

- Mid-block access points occur just there, mid-block and not at intersections. All of the mid blocks identified in the graphic minus one, are at intersections and not mid-blocks.

Page 138

- The content of this sheet belongs in TAB 11.
- Although the frontage zone is listed at 150', what should the buffer depth actually be that will contain the required plant material?
- Update the plant requirements where noted as they are less restrictive than the UDO.
- Do not repeat the percentage of required plant material again.
- The dimension provided on the graphic is 200' wide, but the text provided to support the graphic states 150'?
- Correct the spelling of Valdai Street.
- Correct the requirements under the Design Guidelines to reflect the location of the proposed shrubs and any freestanding walls.
- The statement for 360-degree architecture can be re-written per the example provided to be more clear.

Page 139

- Correct the spelling of Valdai Street.

Page 140

- This page belongs in TAB 11.
- Sections are typically accompanied by a plan view showing where the section is taken.
- The table titles should be at the top of the table, not the bottom.
- Update the cross section to reflect the correct verbiage concerning curbside landscapes.
- Is the median landscaping as shown being installed by the Metro District and maintained by them?
- Update the language provided in the descriptions to reflect a non-urban condition. See comments provided.

Page 141

- Crusher fines cannot be used as a mulch treatment or in between shrub beds in the curbside landscape. Mulch shall be true rock or wood mulch.
- Include the title of the table at the top of the table and enlarge it.
- Update the terminology/headings in the table as these should not be used unless the street cross section proposed is truly urban. Applies to ALL street cross sections represented in this document.
- Contact the plans reviewer Kelly Bish to get a copy of the minimum median landscape requirements that were recently adopted by Council.
- Make sure this page occurs in TAB 11.

Page 142

- Make sure this page occurs in TAB 11.
- Correct the spelling of Valdai Street.
- Update the tables provided to reflect curbside landscaping and not an urban condition.
- Please note that any curbside landscape less than 10' in width, can only be shrubs and a certain percentage of ornamental grasses and native seed. Table to the left on this sheet, does not acknowledge that.
- Is the cross section mislabeled as G when it should be C?

Page 143

- This page should be included in TAB 11.



- Update Table 7 turf permissions per the comment provided.
- Similar comments as provided on the previous street cross sections.

Page 144

- Update the call-out for the cross section. Not sure if it is supposed to be D or E.
- What is meant by 27% pf the total area of the walkable main street shall be common outdoor space? Total area of what?
- Update the cross section provided as it is a true urban condition and should reflect the urban condition labels of throughway, furnishing zone etc.

Page 145

- Are tree grates the only option if an urban condition? Are tree openings not permitted at 5'x15'?
- Will a suspended pavement system be provided to provide more ample tree root growth area?
- If a true urban condition, then turf would not be permitted.

Page 146

- Update/correct the section designation
- Update Table 11 to remove the use of sod as it is only permitted in curbside areas that are 10' in width or wider.

Page 147

- Update/correct the section designation
- Update Table 11 to remove the use of sod as it is only permitted in curbside areas that are 10' in width or wider.

Page 148

- Is Aurora One constructing 1/2 the median? Will the Metro District maintain the median? What are the landscape standards for the median? Will there be a minimum of one tree provided per 40 linear feet of curbside landscape for Picadilly, 6th and the Boundary Road?
- Update the label for the cross section as noted.

Page 149

- This graphic should also include the intended parking layout/scenario relative to the street.
- Coordinate with the Case Manager, but code does not permit more than 60 percent parking along a street frontage for a depth of 80 feet.
- Please note; That drive thru lanes are not permitted between the building and street. They must be not visible to the street.
- Coordinate with the Case Manager, but code does not permit more than 60 percent of the lot frontage on an arterial or collector street to a depth of 60; to be occupied by parking.

Page 150

- This page belongs in TAB 11
- Drive-throughs are not permitted by code between the street and building. Refer to UDO standards.
- Refer to the UDO landscape standards regarding minimum drive-thru screening requirements. This does not meet the minimum.
- Minimum buffer heights are specified in the UDO and are greater than 30".
- Please update the standards provided to include that street and non-street buffers are required in accordance with the UDO.
- Update the description for screen walls. They should match the architecture of the buildings and not signage.

Page 151

- Please read the parking block standards with the landscape section of the UDO. The Master Plan is supposed to meet the minimum standards and exceed those. This does not meet the minimum standards.
- This page belongs in the landscape TAB 11.

Page 152

- Include a graphic to depict what item number 6 is attempting to portray.
- The internal sidewalk does not appear to meet the minimum width as described in the Parking Block standards of the UDO.
- The number of parking spaces in a row exceeds city minimums. Refer to the UDO, landscape section regarding



this.

- Sod is not permitted in parking lot islands.
- Work with your Case Manager, but the building siting and configuration should likely be in another section and not the Urban Design Standards.

Page 153

- Building perimeter landscaping is required for all multi-family buildings UNLESS the building is adjacent to an urban sidewalk condition i.e. a 16' wide hardscape area.

Page 154

- Do not replicate this information for each neighborhood. See comment provided on page 150 under PLEASE NOTE. Have one set of requirements, make sure they meet the UDO standards at a minimum, list only the differences that need to be addressed for each neighborhood, but don't repeat the exact standards for each neighborhood.

Page 155

- The residential parking example image should be included on the next page as that is where that item is discussed.

Page 156

- Update the language regarding parking lot landscaping. Include the use of screen walls. Retaining walls and/or screen walls are encouraged as a screening mechanism as opposed to discouraged as currently noted.
- Make sure this sheet is included and combined with other parking lot standards in TAB 11.

Page 159

- Update the graphic to state signage and wayfinding map.
- Place the title above the graphic and bold.

Page 160

- What about specific residential neighborhood signs? Will the various neighborhoods not have unique identifying signage specific to that neighborhood? They can play off one another in material, color etc.

Page 166

- Street trees are not an option for selection within the streetscape zone. They are required by code.
- Street trees in urban condition shall be spaced 35' on center, not 36'.
- The E-470 Views and Relationships information has already been discussed previously on page 138. Do not repeat here. Have in one location only. Work with your Case Manger if unsure.

Page 167

- Services areas shall be screened by both walls or fencings etc. and landscaping. Not one or the other but both.

Page 168

- Refer to the UDO on drive thru screening requirements, this does not meet the minimum requirements.

TAB 8 Land Use Map, Land Use Matrix and Standard Notes

Page 112

- Update the language in this document to replace waivers with adjustments and FDP with Master Plan.

Page 113

- Is the area designated as mixed use really mixed use or multi-family? The legend conflicts with the plan.

Page 115

- Update this sheet per the comments provided.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

13. Civil Engineering (Kristin Tanabe / 303-739-7306 / ktanabe@auroragov.org / Comments in green)

Tab 10

13A. Per the standard street sections, the hardscape goes to ROW, with a 2' recovery zone behind the ROW, typical.

13B. Decorative paving or raised feature is not permitted in ROW, typical.

13C. Note that canopies encroaching into ROW must be removable and require a license agreement.

Tab 13 - PIP

13D. The master plan will not be approved by public works until the master drainage study is approved.



13E. In the interim there will be two travel lanes and no parking (24' pavement).

13F. This is the 2' recovery zone.

13G. Include typical section for Hogan Parkway.

14. Traffic Engineering (Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / bmedema@auroragov.org / Comments in orange)
Comments from Traffic Engineering will be provided separately.

15. Aurora Water (Casey Ballard / 303-739-7382 / cballard@auroragov.org / Comments in red)
Please continue working with Aurora Water on the updates to the Master Utility Study.

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

General:

- See redlines within the Tab 9 open space map and Form J and within the FDP Maps document
- Based on your total unit count you should be providing the following: 8.45 acres of Neighborhood Park, 21.97 acres of Open Space, and 3.1 acres of Community Park paid in cash in lieu.

FDP Maps

- Remove table from this map page, see comments on Tab 9.
- Correspond all labels to the correct line.
- There should be another service radius around the second park Pa7. Park service radius must cover all residential on site.
- Identify this as a community at 8' in width (not local) as it is an important connection between parks and the regional trail.
- Re-shade as open space where it's shown as community park. Create a separate planning area.
- Remove the community park. There is nothing on site that is eligible for community park land dedication as the minimum size is 40 acres.
- Not all residential is covered by park service radii. Please add new radii around PA7 park and ensure it covers this residential area to the south. If it does not, you may need to shift some uses or add a 0.5-acre pocket park for coverage and open space credit.
- Regional trail is not aligned as shown. Trail is to continue south along the west side of the creek.

Tab 9 Open Space Map and Form J

- Remove entire box
- Revise notes to just say: detention which does not drain within 24 hours is not eligible for land dedication credit.
- Revise note to say: floodplain is not eligible for land dedication; there is no anticipated floodplain designated on site.
- Revise to say: two playgrounds (2-5, 5-12) [...]. Neighborhood parks are required to have both parks on one site which should be designed adjacent and in coordination.
- Make sure entire table is showing. Form J is required to have a signature line for the Director of Parks, Recreation and Open Space with a date line
- Revise all triggers to identify that this is 'constructed by developer [...]
- Add note that all community park will be paid in cash in lieu.
- Only put the acreage that's being credited (take out the parenthesis amount as its confusing)
- Total all land dedication at the bottom of Form J

17. Fire / Life Safety (Mark Apodaca / 303-739-7656 / mapodaca@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)
Master Utility Report

17A. Sheet 5 – see comment concerning fire flow: Please include industrial fire flow demand.

18. Xcel Energy (Donna George / 303-571-3306 / donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com)

18A. See the attached comment letter.



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

19A. See the attached comment letter.

20. Mile High Flood Control District (Morgan Lynch / 303-455-6277 / mlynch@udfcd.org)

20A. See the attached comment letter.



Right of Way & Permits

1123 West 3rd Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80223
Telephone: **303.571.3306**
Facsimile: 303. 571.3284
donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com

October 27, 2020

City of Aurora Planning and Development Services
15151 E. Alameda Parkway, 2nd Floor
Aurora, CO 80012

Attn: Christopher Johnson

Re: Aurora One – 2nd referral, Case # DA-2241-00

As stated in response to the first referral **Aurora One**, for future planning and to ensure that adequate utility easements are available within this development and per state statutes, PSCo will be requesting its standard distribution utility easement widths for commercial/industrial (10-foot perimeter around lots) and for residential (6-feet for natural gas, 8-feet for electric lines and pedestals), and apartment-type (10-foot around perimeter) lots within the development.

The property owner/developer/contractor is reminded: 1) to complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or *modification* to the existing overhead and underground electric distribution facilities via xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect; 2) that additional easements *will* need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities; and, 3) that there is no objection to a proposed rezone, contingent upon PSCo's ability to maintain all existing rights and this amendment should not hinder our ability for future expansion, including all present and any future accommodations for natural gas transmission and electric transmission related facilities.

Comment response requested.

Donna George
Right of Way and Permits
Public Service Company of Colorado dba Xcel Energy
Office: 303-571-3306 – Email: donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com



Public Works and Development

6924 South Lima Street
Centennial, CO 80112-3853
Phone: 720-874-6500
Fax: 720-874-6611
Relay Colorado: 711
www.arapahoegov.com

BRYAN D. WEIMER, PWLF
Director

October 15, 2020

City of Aurora Planning & Development Services
15151 E Alameda Parkway, Ste 2300
Aurora, CO 80012
Attn: Planning Department Case Manager

RE: Aurora One Master Plan
DA-2241-00

Engineering Services Division of Arapahoe County Public Works and Development (Staff) thanks you for the opportunity to review the outside referral for the proposed Aurora One Master Plan. The purpose of this letter is to inform you that we have the following comments regarding the referral at this time based on the information submitted:

1. The western section of the proposed plan appears to be within the Airport Influence Area (60 LDN) which restricts residential use and residential zoning. Noise sensitive uses may be permitted including schools or non-aviation related training centers with construction mitigation measures required. Please ensure the development complies with these restrictions.

Please know that other Divisions in the Public Works Department may submit comments as well.

Thank you,
Sarah White

Arapahoe County Public Works & Development
Engineering Services Division
cc Arapahoe County Case No. O20-147

MAINTENANCE ELIGIBILITY PROGRAM (MEP)

MHFD Referral Review Comments

For Internal MHFD Use Only.	
MEP ID:	107828
Submittal ID:	10005307
MEP Phase:	Referral

Date: October 28, 2020
To: Public Works/Engineering
Via email
RE: MHFD Referral Review Comments

Project Name:	Aurora One (RSN 1464400)
Drainageway:	Coal Creek (Arapahoe County)

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:

- Open Channel Improvements upstream of Pond J.1
- Regional Detention Ponds J.1 and J.2
- Impacts to Alicia Way

We have the following comments to offer:

- 1) Thank you for the comment responses provided to these comments. Our previous comment letter was provided both for this PIP submittal and the Master Drainage Report submittal because of providing similar information. However, some previous comments regarding flow and channel design can't be addressed with this PIP. The District will review the MDR when it is resubmitted and provide relevant comments at that time.
- 2) While the drainage area contributing to Alicia Way has been reduced by E-470, there is still a concentrated flow path west of E-470 and a clear confluence with Coal Creek. Please help us understand how flows conveyed by Alicia Way will be gathered and conveyed with the proposed development. If possible, the existing confluence area should be maintained, even if the flow alignment is adjusted.
- 3) The comment regarding steep, proposed grades refers to the southern portion of the site near Alicia Way. There is a concern for the geomorphic stability of the banks of Coal Creek which may impact the proposed grading in this area. The District has passed the question along to a geomorphologist for her review. Any comments she has may be passed along after this letter.

We appreciate the opportunity to review this proposal. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,



Mark Schutte, P.E., CFM
Project Engineer, Sand Creek Watershed
Mile High Flood District