



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

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

August 13, 2020

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

Re: Initial 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 initial submission, which we started to process on Monday, July 20, 2020. We reviewed it and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments and outside referral agencies.

Since many important issues still remain, you will need to make another submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission on or before Thursday, September 3, 2020. Your Planning Commission hearing date for the Zoning Map Amendment portion of your application is tentatively set for Wednesday, December 9, 2020 and City Council tentatively set for Monday, December 21, 2020. Our Administrative Decision date for your Master Plan is tentatively scheduled for Wednesday, November 25, 2020. Keep in mind, these dates are predicated on the assumption that all submissions are made on time and all staff comments are sufficiently addressed and are subject to change accordingly if these conditions are not met.

Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a cover letter specifically responding to each item. The Planning Department reserves the right to reject any resubmissions that fail to address these items. If you have made any other changes to your documents other than those requested, be sure to also specifically list them in your letter.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please give me a call. I may be reached at 303-739-7112.

Sincerely,

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\2241-00rev1.rtf



Initial Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

- Review all redline comments throughout all documents.
- Significant elaboration is needed on many of the elements in the first submittal (see Item 2)
- Ensure code references are to the UDO or applicable regulations.
- More detail and refinement are needed for all maps and graphics.
- Provide more graphic and narrative descriptions on the boundaries of the various neighborhoods (see Item 2)
- Establish more definitive standards and guidelines in your next submittal (see Item 2)
- The Master Plan must illustrate that all required elements of the MU-R district are provided (see Item 3)
- The proposed adjustment referenced in the Master Plan will not be supported (see Item 5)
- Provide Urban Design, Architectural, and Landscape Standards with your next submittal (see Item 7)
- Coordinate with Porter Ingram to convey the required Avigation Easement for this site (see Item 9)
- Review and address all Public Works and Traffic comments on the PIP (see Items 11 and 12)
- Updates are required to the Master Utility Study. Coordinate with Aurora Water for a meeting (see Item 13)
- Make all required changes to the Form J and other documents as mentioned by PROS (see Item 14)
- Coordinate with outside referral agencies.
- Review the FDP Manual and all provided examples for your next submittal.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

An overarching theme of the comments of this review concerns the location of Aurora One in the MU-R zone district. The MUR zone district has unique requirements to support the purpose and intent of the district. Many of these special requirements are located in the description of the zoning district UDO Section 2.4.7 and these requirements 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:

1. Design principles/guidelines and standards for each feature;
2. Conceptual photos or renderings that illustrate the intent;
3. 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:

1. Focal Point;
2. Intersection plazas;
3. Walkable Main Street;
4. High Visibility Sites; and
5. Boundary roads.

Design principles/guidelines and standards should include common themes and unifying elements that tie the development together and make the development unique. Please clearly identify those themes and unifying elements.

Please include a narrative that includes design principles/guidelines and standards for unique or challenging elements of your plan. Please also include representative photos or renderings to illustrate your intent.

Based on the proposal, those unique or challenging plan areas should likely include: (1) relating to identified assets of a "gateway" to Aurora and views of the Front Range, what specific locations and principles will be applied to support and enhance these assets. (2) Development Along the drainage south of the Parkway includes both assets and challenges. (3) Integrating the PA-3 Pond into the neighborhoods as usable park space. (4) E-470 Frontage (5)



relationship of development adjacent to the park spaces to the park spaces. (6) Aside from the main street, what sort of commercial/mixed-use/office character and scale are anticipated along the Parkway, Picadilly, and E-470.

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

1A. 11 adjacent property owners and 4 registered neighborhood organizations were notified of the proposed Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment. At this time no comments were received from members of the public. Several comments have been received from outside referral agencies, which are included at the end of this letter.

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

2A. General Comment: All of the maps, exhibits, and narratives submitted are oversimplified and do not provide the level of detail necessary for review and for obtaining an effective understanding of the vision for Aurora One. Maps and graphics must be able to read in black and white, so please consider this in your design and layout of exhibits and use a hierarchy of line work that is accurately explained in the legends and translates appropriately when printed in black and white. The Letter of Introduction should be elaborated to describe the vision for the project and its character. Please review all the detailed redline comments and review the FDP (Master Plan) manual to be sure that all required elements are provided, and the attached examples of an approved Master Plan for the level of quality and detail that is expected.

2B. Revise Tab 1 (Letter of Introduction) to reference Section 146-5.4.1.E.3 Criteria of Approval for a Master Plan per the UDO. Letter currently references the previous code.

2C. The font utilized on the Master Plan cover sheet is too light and difficult to read electronically, and it will not read on printed Mylars. Please revise the text to a darker/more prominent font.

2D. On the Land Use Map (Tab 8) include a thin-line or grayed out background grid which divides the entire map into ten-acre segments. The planning area boundaries should be solid heavy lines. The line symbology chosen for the High Visibility sites does not properly illustrate their location and extent.

2E. When reading the FDP Manual, consider that the instructions are attempting to explain how to assemble a physical binder as an FDP submittal. This also translates to the expected organization of these items when broken apart into electronic files. In your next submittal, please reorganize the submittals so that they are in accordance with the FDP Manual and provide a physical binder submittal as well. There should be a written narrative associated with each tab included on the next submittal.

2F. Per the FDP Manual, 2-foot contours should be shown on the Open Space and Circulation Map (Tab #9). This map is currently difficult to interpret as shown and adding another element will increase this issue. Please review the provided example for an appropriate attempt at communicated all required information.

2G. Form J should be included on the Open Space and Circulation Map.

2H. The neighborhoods are numbered on Tab 9, but the boundaries and area of the various proposed neighborhoods is not clear. Perhaps highlighting each neighborhood on a different page would suffice, as doing so here might be too noisy. Boundaries and area of each neighborhood must be shown somewhere in the Master Plan, perhaps on the Master Plan Community Wayfinding map.

2I. Please provide a clearer vision for Aurora One with the next submittal. Terms such as “enhance livable space”, “emphasis on regional materials”, pedestrian scale detailing”, “clear hierarchy of façade design”, urban core/living/lifestyle”, and “eliminating undesirable spaces” are used throughout several of the narratives, but these terms are too high-level and don’t provide an idea of how they will be achieved without design standards. Please refine this vision to illustrate, elaborate on, and be consistent with what is being proposed.

2J. The purpose of the Master Plan and the associated documents is to have definitive requirements that ensure a clear vision is carried out as the project develops over several years. The Master Plan should set clear expectations for future development and all parties should have a similar understanding of the type and quality of development that is required. More concrete, detailed information must be provided with the next submittal.



2K. Please remove all AutoCAD SHX text from the “Comment” section of all PDFs and flatten the documents to remove the ability to select items. This makes it difficult for staff to review and comment on PDFs. The next submittal will not be accepted if documents are not flattened.

2L. Review all documents for spelling and grammar. There are several instances throughout of minor errors.

2M. The Existing Conditions Map and the Natural Features Map (Tab 4) both need more detail provided. Show adjacent subdivisions, airport overlay boundaries and LDN contours, existing roadways and their classifications and ROW width, any existing utilities, and other elements listed in FDP manual. Review redline comments.

3. Zoning and Land Use Issues

3A. The MU-R zone district is intended to create image-making areas of Aurora and should create a recognizable skyline or silhouette. The level of detail provided on MU-R compliance map is not enough to ensure that all required elements of the MU-R district are being provided.

3B. For the Neighborhood Character Matrix, include a high-level overview and then move detail to separate page.

3C. Full Landscape and Urban Design standards must be included with your next submittal. Please review the FPD Manual and the provided example for the appropriate format and level of detail.

3D. The proposal for the “Village Center” neighborhood to be placed at the furthest edge of the project seems counterintuitive. As mentioned in other comments, it is still not fully clear from the provided maps and narratives what the boundaries and expected character of this (or any) neighborhood is. More detail will help flush out these topics

4. Environmental Issues

4A. Due to the project’s location within the Buckley AFB Noise Influence District, certain noise mitigation measures are required for different residential and commercial development. Your Site Analysis Narrative (Form A) should elaborate on proposed noise mitigation measures as part of the design response element.

4B. What are some more specific design approaches to capitalize on the views, especially from the common spaces?

5. Adjustment Issues

5A. Detailed, substantive justification must be provided in Tab 6 (FDP Narrative) for any requested adjustments to be included with the Master Plan, and must meet at least one of the criteria of approval in Section 146-5.4.4.D.3.c. Use specific standards for vehicle fueling stations require that primary buildings shall front the street and fueling area canopies shall be set back behind buildings when site constraints such as easements, floodplains, utilities, or others do not impact building placement. This is to improve site design and screening and a perception of improved development quality. The proposal at hand to waive this requirement specifically goes against the criteria of approval that “The adjustment will result in a perception of development quality as viewed from adjacent streets and abutting lots that is equal to or better than would have been required without the adjustment”. The justification provided in the Master Plan narrative is inadequate, as the items listed are design preferences rather than site constraints. Considering this and the location of the proposed gas station at a prominent location in the MU-R zone and as an entrance point to Aurora One, this request will not be supported.

6. Street, Connectivity, and Pedestrian Issues

6A. Per the FDP Manual, local streets should not be shown on the Master Plan.

6B. Illustrate connections to the indicated Triple Creek trail system (Tab #9).

7. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

7A. How does your design approach this project tie back to being a Gateway to Aurora? More definitive information should be provided on how this project will establish itself as a unique, recognizable, and high-quality gateway point and urban district of Aurora.

7B. The proposed location for the Walkable Main Street in the far northwest corner of Aurora One is not appropriate. At least one other location must be provided in order to meet MU-R requirements. 6th Avenue is a major road and Aurora One does not have control over both sides of this roadway, as well as the fact that the adjacent residential in Horizon Uptown on the north side of the street will likely be oriented with their backs to 6th Avenue. These conditions



contradict the intent of the walkable environment and won't meet the MU-R requirements.

The indicated location is a more suitable option for a Walkable Main Street location, although not the only possible option. It is centrally located in Aurora One, provides a better location for a Focal Point as defined by Article 4.6-6, connects to an adjacent arterial, and does not border strictly residential uses like those adjacent in Horizon Uptown in NW corner. Wherever the Walkable Main Street is placed within Aurora One, your Master Plan and design standards must demonstrate that it creates a low-speed, pedestrian oriented environment, with buildings, storefronts and plazas fronting the majority of both sides of the street and build to lines established. All other required elements must be accommodated by the proposed location.

7C. The focal point must be "a distinctively designed building or feature which is visible from E-470". More information on what is proposed or expected in the indicated focal point location to ensure all requirements are being met. Review the definition of "Focal Point" in Article 146-6 of the UDO to ensure code compliance.

7D. Complete and detailed Urban Design, Landscape, and Architectural Standards (Tabs 10, 11, and 12) must be provided with your next submittal. Review the FDP Manual and the provided examples for all required elements and the expected levels of specificity. Standards in all cases must be of equal or better quality than related standards in the UDO.

7E. Specific details and examples for all categories in Tab 11 (Urban Design Standards), such as entry monuments, retaining walls, fencing, lighting, etc. must be provided. These details are then referred to when site plans/preliminary plats are submitted in the future to ensure compliance. Additional items to add with Tab 11 include signage standards, street patterns, connectivity (i.e. block sizes), and lot configurations (i.e. requiring certain amounts of alley-loaded products).

7F. Detailed design standards must be provided for each of the proposed uses in the Planning Areas and should provide narrative and visual examples of the proposed architectural styles. Examples should be provided of how each of these styles will be represented in the development Single-Family Attached, Multi-Family, Commercial, Mixed-Use, and Parks and Open Space areas.

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

8A. Per NEATS (2018), Figure ES-5, both 6th Avenue and Picadilly Road are defined as Primary Bike Routes, with separated bike lanes and trails.

8B. Per NEATS (2018), Figure ES-5, both Steven D Hogan Parkway, 6th Avenue and Picadilly Road are identified as future high frequency transit routes, with separated bike lanes and trails. Circulation plan should specifically mention that Picadilly Road and 38th Avenue will have transit stops in future in coordination with RTD.

8C. On Master Plan CIRCULATION sheet, "On Street Bike Lane" and "On Street pedestrian Connection" symbology needs to be distinctive from each other.

9. Airport Issues (Porter Ingrum / 303-739-7227 / pingrum@auroragov.org)

9A. Because this property is located within the Airport Influence District of Buckley Air Force Base, the applicant must assure that an avigation easement has been conveyed to the City of Aurora and Buckley AFB for all parcels in the Framework Development Plan and that this easement has been recorded with the Arapahoe County Clerk and Recorder in accordance with Code prior to the FDP being recorded. To streamline this process, the City of Aurora will record the avigation easement for the applicant. The applicant is responsible for completing the easement form (found [here](#)), obtaining the property owner's signature and notarizing the document. Please include a legal description and survey of the property. The completed easement form can be dropped off or emailed to Porter Ingrum.

9B. This parcel is located in the Noise Influence District (NID) of Buckley Air Force Base. New residential uses or new residential structures permitted by the underlying zone must provide and include noise level reduction in the design and construction of all habitable structures.

9C. Development in the AID shall comply with height restrictions in the underlying zone district, which do not intrude into 14 CFR 77 surfaces for military airports. Vendors of real property located within the Airport Influence District are required to provide notice to prospective purchasers in accordance with Code. The notice will state that



the property may be subject to some of the annoyances or inconveniences associated with proximity to an airport including noise, vibration, and odors.

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

PIP Narrative and Exhibits

10A. While labels have been provided to call out the road types, use three different colors for the roads to help distinguish them. They all read the same being brown. Add a color block/key/legend to each road cross section to assist in finding them on the sheet.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

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

Master Plan Document

11A. Street lights on public roadways will be owned and maintained by the City of Aurora and must meet COA standards.

11B. Note 16 is inconsistent with the PIP.

PIP Narrative and Exhibits

11C. Please remove AutoCAD SHX text items in the comment section. Please flatten to reduce select-ability of the items.

11D. The master plan will not be approved by public works until the master drainage report is approved.

11E. The PIP is not a phasing plan. It shall not assume improvements were installed with a previous planning area. Please correct the narrative and exhibits to reflect this.

11F. Make the requested edits to the roadway improvements narrative shown on page 3.

11G. How are Stephen D. Hogan Parkway roadway improvements proposed to be funded and constructed? More information on the proposed mechanism must be included. Will adjacent developments be responsible for any of the improvements? Curbside landscaping, sidewalk or street lights?

11H. There is no section or detail provided for what the walkable main street will look like.

11I. There is nothing provided in the exhibits that indicates the construction of the proposed basins.

11J. The narrative and exhibits are intended to show what improvements are required if only that particular planning area is developed. There are other improvements that don't seem related to the planning area and not described in the narrative that are shown on the exhibit.

11K. Based on the exhibit, other roadways, the detention ponds and channels will be constructed with planning area 1. Typical multiple planning areas.

11L. The only storm sewer shown in the exhibit is the outfall from the detention pond to the east of the planning area. Is this detention pond going to be constructed with this planning area?

11M. Local Type 3 streets are used for commercial areas. Local Type 1 is intended for residential areas. Typical.

11N. Adjacent Picadilly improvements?

11O. Indicate all intersections that are identified as POTENTIAL FUTURE SIGNAL, typical for all exhibits.

11P. Include a section for 6th Avenue consistent with the Horizon Uptown PIP. Include sections for Picadilly including at the south end of the site.

11Q. Are the secondary roads intended to be public or private?

11R. The PIP is approved with the master plan and not modified with every site plan submittal. If you mean to say subsequent Preliminary Plat or Site Plan submittals, that would suffice.

11S. It makes more sense for the exhibits to follow the narrative in terms of order.

11T. Shouldn't the indicated channel on sheet 11 be included?

11U. Make sure only the improvements required with this development are highlighted for construction.

11V. Please use another method to indicate "walkable main street" as it is difficult to see the color hatch for 6th Avenue improvements. Perhaps the typical section for 6th Avenue can represent that improvement.

11W. Are these roads and utilities going to be constructed with PA-1? 6th Avenue is not constructed here. What will this road tie to? Typical multiple exhibits.

11X. Are the two detention ponds and channels going to be constructed with whatever planning area develops first?



11Y. Would the connection of 6th Avenue back to Picadilly also be required? The indicated connection on sheet 16-20 can't be made until 6th Avenue extends to this intersection.

Master Drainage Report

11Z. Review redline comments throughout Master Drainage Report.

12. Traffic Engineering (Brianna Medema / 303-739-7336 / bmedema@auroragov.org / Comments in orange)

Master Plan Document

12A. Add "Per the City's Traffic Signal Escrow Ordinance" in the indicated note. Remove note 16.

12B. Remove this label, both of these are identified as RI/RO in the MTIS, and full movement is not appropriate.

12C. Review all comments concerning the labeling of intersections and their movement types. Address all labels as requested.

12D. The indicated location is not a future signalized intersection (per MTIS) pedestrian crossing at this location may not be suitable at this location without significant improvement (grade separation, etc). Consider shifting this connection to the signalized location north (see orange path).

12E. Existing Valdai St needs to be updated/realigned and an intersection created. This is an appropriate location for a roundabout.

12F. Relabel "enhanced pedestrian crossing" Will use FHA Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Crossing Locations. Striped crosswalk may not be the only required improvement to meet the safety need.

PIP Narrative and Exhibits

12G. Master Traffic Impact Study (MTIS) did not address classification, updates in this area may be required.

12H. Signals shall be based on Traffic Signal Escrow Ordinance. Remove from this area unless the future funding mechanism will be the entity paying Traffic Signal Escrow.

12I. Traffic Signal Escrow applies to future signalized locations. OK if responsibility is given to a certain funding mechanism but shall be paid prior to BP of adjacent developments.

12J. Is the development constructing signals when warranted or paying Traffic Signal Escrow and having the City construct?

12K. Add "enhanced pedestrian crossings" to requested planning areas.

12L. See all comments on access movements on the "Master Plan Circulation Plan" All of these comments align the document to the MTIS.

12M. All Collectors may be required to be 3-lane collectors (pending MTIS update). Include both two & three lane collector sections.

12N. The indicated intersection of Valdai may need significant geometric updates to meet City standards.

12O. Note 4 is correct. Update the PIP text to match.

Traffic Impact Study

12P. Trip Generation internal trip capture and walking % reduction does not appear to be taken. Pass-by trip reduction was not handled as desired. Update & review all analysis/recommendations.

12Q. LOS analysis needs to address movement LOS of F when a single lane is proposed. See comments throughout on this issue, some locations require analysis of alternatives and some require additional text only.

12R. Some highlights are just agreement/highlighting of important information. Where comments are added, modification are required.

12S. Pedestrian Safety

- Will use FHA Guide for Improving Pedestrian Safety at Uncontrolled Crossing Locations. Striped crosswalk may not be the only required improvement to meet the safety need.

- concerns for proposed pedestrian crossings a mid-block locations of Valdai St

- Where is the discussion of the Traffic Calming elements? Roundabouts appear to have been removed.

12T. Include a figure with ADT on both surrounding roadway & internal roadway with classification.

12U. See comments throughout.

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

PIP Narrative and Exhibits

13A. PA-2 should include water main within Stephen D Hogan. In general, all water needed to provide a looped supply is needed for each planning area. Typical for all planning areas.



Master Utility Report

13B. Page 9: Must include offsite development. This includes Horizon Uptown (COA# 218158)

13C. Page 12: This layout needs to be show on the Concept Water Design sheet.

13D. Page 13: Provide the electronic files for these tables.

13E. Page 30: I would like to have a separate meeting regarding the sewer flow layout. Offsite flows need to be included and peaking should be calculated at each design point, not for each basin. It also appears on the next sheet that the design points are only show what is going into the 18-inch main. The design points should include all upstream flows, meaning DP 6 should include 1-5 and offsite flows.

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

General Comments:

- Please reach out and schedule a meeting with PROS before your next submittal to address the comments outlined below.
- PROS has some concern over the proposed detention areas within the neighborhood parks. Please work with PROS to provide some high-level concepts on the goals of these sites and the integration with the detention. Please note that detention lacking 24-hour recovery is not eligible for land dedication and will not be owned/maintained by PROS.
- Total land dedication required based on the 742 single family attached and 340 multifamily include the following:
 - Neighborhood Park-8.45ac
 - Community Park- 3.10ac
 - Open Space- 21.97ac

Master Plan:

- Pg. 2:
 - Update Form D with the redlines provided, please note that calculations are lower than you had presented.
 - Note that Community Park will need to be paid in cash-in-lieu and is based on the per acre value of your site. Based on the total units proposed, you're looking at about 3.10 acres of CP total due with the plats for the residential areas.
 - Please note that any detention ponds which do not drain within 24 hours may not count toward the total NP land dedication acreage. PROS also will not own/maintain detention ponds which do not drain, and you'll need to coordinate with AW on maintenance eligibility.
- Pg. 4:
 - Verify that the channel is not floodplain and may be counted toward OS
 - Please more clearly delineate the service radius boundary and update with new park area.
 - Not all residential is covered by the service radius, please adjust park locations to cover all or consider putting a pocket park on the south side of Stephen d Hogan to provide service. Pocket parks provide ¼ mile service radius, must be 0.5 acres at minimum, and may be counted toward OS credit.
 - Please note that the detention areas may not outfall through the conservation easement property to get to coal creek. Ensure outfall is going through infrastructure in Piccadilly, work with PW.
 - Remove tree lawn notation on conservation easement property.
 - Please provide Form J on this map page in lieu of the information listed on the side. Or re-arrange to provide it on the following page.
 - Overall, PROS has some concerns on how the parks will be designed with the inclusion os such a large detention area. Please provide a high-level concept design which outlines the parks and open space with respect to detention. Where will you be able to provide the two required playgrounds and open turf field as required? Please work with PROS on how parks/open space may be better integrated to meet the needs of the site the requirements for design and amenities.
- Pg. 6:
 - Please note that there are several edits that need to be made to Form J in regard to proposed park and open space on site and final ownership and maintenance. Worth with PROS before the next submittal to determine eligibility for ownership.



- Please ensure that you update the triggers within Form J to be more specific and ensure consistency with the PIP. See redlines.
- A signature line is needed on the bottom of Form J. Although PROS does not sign the cover page of the master plan, the director must sign Form J.

PIP:

- The infrastructure plan that you are showing within the PIP shows the detention being significant and making up for a majority of the park and open space parcels. Given the significance of these facilities, it is likely that they do not drain within 24 hours and need to be removed from the land dedication totals.
- Please update the triggers within the PIP to be consistent with Form J. Note that triggers are set and cannot be changed. Please remove the note within the infrastructure plan sheet that says otherwise.

Triple Creek Open Space and Conservation Easement

Please be aware that the south and west portion of your property abut City of Aurora owned property that currently has a conservation easement. This conservation easement requires that no damage to resources occur including any negative impacts from drainage and construction. There is also a 25' special landscape buffer required along all properties that abut this open space. It looks like this has been noted on your master plan documents already.

15. Fire / Life Safety (Mark Apodaca / 303-739-7656 / mapodaca@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)**Context Map**

15A. Will the indicated Local Type 1 street dead-end with a turnaround or will it connect?

16. Public Art (Roberta Bloom / 303-739-6747 / rbloom@auroragov.org)

16A. The Public Art Plan can be added at a later date, but it will be considered a major amendment and it will be required before or concurrent with the first Site Plan/Preliminary Plat submittal. No review will begin on any Site Plan/Preliminary Plat submittal until this document is provided.

17. E-470 Public Highway Authority (Peggy Davenport / 303-537-3727 / pdavenport@e-470.com)

17A. At this time E-470 Public Highway Authority has No Comments regarding the current submittal. We will provide comments on future design and construction documents.

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

18A. See the attached comment letter.

19. Century Link (Don Davalos / 505-767-7449 / don.davalos@centurylink.com)

19A. See the attached comment letter.

20. Aurora Public Schools (Josh Hensley / 303-365-7812 / jdhensley@aurorak12.org)

20A. In accordance with Section 4.3.18 of the Unified Development Ordinance there will be a school land dedication requirement for the Aurora One proposal. The size of that requirement will be based on the number and types of residential units approved. Aurora Public Schools will likely accept cash-in-lieu of land for this obligation valued at market value of zoned land with infrastructure in place. Cash-in-lieu is due at the time of recording of the first plat. Please let me know if you have any questions. The school land dedication requirement for the proposed residential development within the Aurora Public Schools boundary is 5.9815 based on this Master Plan. See the attached student yield document.

21. Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (Morgan Lynch / 303-455-6277 / mlynch@udfcd.org)

21A. See the attached comment letter.



July 30, 2020

City of Aurora Planning & Development Services
Christopher Johnson
chjohnso@auroragov.org
(303) 739-7112

RE: Dev. App. DA-2241-00 Aurora One – Zoning Map Amendment and Master Plan

Mr. Christopher Johnson:

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

No issues or concerns discovered after review.

Please note, the engineer that reviewed this information is William Benson. If any changes should need to be made, please contact him at (720) 578-5142.

Thank you!

Sincerely,

Don Davalos

Don Davalos (Jul 31, 2020, 2:17pm)

Don Davalos
(505) 767-7449
Don.Davalos@centurylink.com

(P830617)



Issuer ATCO Communications Services, LLC

Document generated Fri, 31 Jul 2020 00:03:18 +0100

Document fingerprint e8ecf98304e5632187dae496eb55c85d

Parties involved with this document

Document processed	Party + Fingerprint
Fri, 31 Jul 2020 14:17:52 +0100	Don Davalos - Signer (a63eb5dcb3e821e32dd37f8656bec423)

Audit history log

Date	Action
Fri, 31 Jul 2020 14:17:52 +0100	The envelope has been signed by all parties. (155.70.39.45)
Fri, 31 Jul 2020 14:17:52 +0100	Don Davalos signed the envelope. (155.70.39.45)
Fri, 31 Jul 2020 14:17:35 +0100	Don Davalos viewed the envelope. (155.70.39.45)
Fri, 31 Jul 2020 00:05:51 +0100	Don Davalos viewed the envelope. (54.70.53.60)
Fri, 31 Jul 2020 00:04:14 +0100	Document emailed to don.davalos@centurylink.com (3.10.154.132)
Fri, 31 Jul 2020 00:04:14 +0100	Sent the envelope to Don Davalos (don.davalos@centurylink.com) for signing. (73.254.234.149)
Fri, 31 Jul 2020 00:03:51 +0100	Don Davalos has been assigned to this envelope (73.254.234.149)
Fri, 31 Jul 2020 00:03:38 +0100	Document generated with fingerprint e8ecf98304e5632187dae496eb55c85d (73.254.234.149)
Fri, 31 Jul 2020 00:03:18 +0100	Envelope generated by Victoria Comer (73.254.234.149)

AURORA PUBLIC SCHOOLS - STUDENT YIELD
8/10/2020

Aurora 1 Mater Plan- 1st Submittal

Dwelling Type	Units	Yield Ratio	Student Yield
SFD		0.7	0
MF-LOW	741	0.3	222
MF-HIGH	339	0.145	49
TOTAL	1,080		271

YIELD	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE SCHOOL		K-8 TOTAL	HIGH SCHOOL		K-12
	RATIO	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	STUDENTS	RATIO	STUDENTS	TOTAL
SF	0.34	0	0.16	0	0	0.2	0	0
MF-LOW	0.17	126	0.08	59	185	0.05	37	222
MF-HIGH	0.075	25	0.04	14	39	0.03	10	49
TOTAL		151		73	224		47	271

SCHOOL TYPE	STUDENT YIELD	ACRES PER CHILD	ACRES REQUIRED
ELEMENTARY	151	0.0175	2.6494
MIDDLE	73	0.025	1.8210
HIGH	47	0.032	1.5110
TOTAL	271		5.9815

Housing Type	Size	Density	Number of Units
MFL	49.43	15	741
MFH	22.626	15	339

MAINTENANCE ELIGIBILITY PROGRAM (MEP)

MHFD Referral Review Comments

For Internal MHFD Use Only.	
MEP ID:	107828
Submittal ID:	10005002
MEP Phase:	Referral

Date: August 3, 2020
To: Public Works/Engineering
Via email
RE: MHFD Referral Review Comments

Project Name:	Aurora One (RSN 1471398)
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) How were the design flows for the channel upstream of Pond J.1 determined? Flows should be taken from the 2016 Sand Creek Right Bank Tributaries OSP. Upstream and downstream design points correspond to 1603 (654 cfs) and 1602 (687 cfs) from this study, respectively. Please update the design accordingly.
- 2) For the channel upstream of Pond J.1, our expectation is that Low Maintenance Stream improvements will be utilized to be eligible for MHFD maintenance assistance.
- 3) Based on the conceptual plans provided, it appears that an MHFD maintenance eligible drainageway (>130 acres tributary), Alicia Way, is being graded over and removed. Is there an opportunity to preserve the stream corridor through the area designated for Single Family Attached Residential planned on the southern portion of the site?
- 4) In addition to preserving the existing drainageway, the proposed grading in this portion of the site is concerning. Proposed grades appear to create a steep bank 5' to 15' taller than existing. The banks of Coal Creek through this section of the stream are already very sandy and unstable. The development should reconsider land use and grading in this portion of the site.
- 5) Please provide UD-Detention sheets for both regional detention ponds. These calculations can then be used in SWMM to route flows.

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

Sincerely,

Project Name: Aurora One
MEP ID: 107828/10005002
Date: 08/03/20

Mile High Flood Control District (MHFD)
MEP Referral Review Comments



Morgan Lynch, P.E., CFM
Project Manager, Watershed Services
Mile High Flood District