



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

Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

August 10, 2021

GVP Windler LLC
5750 DTC Parkway, Suite 210
Greenwood Village, CO 80111

Re: Initial Submission Review – Windler Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment
Application Number: **DA-1707-07**
Case Number(s): 2005-2017-01; 2021-7006-00

Dear Mr. Fellows:

Thank you for your initial submission, which we started to process on July 12, 2021. We reviewed it and attached our comments along with this cover letter. The first section of our review highlights our major comments. The following sections contain more specific comments, including those received from other city departments and community members.

Since several 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, August 26, 2021. Note that all our comments are numbered. When you resubmit, include a cover letter specifically responding to each item marked with an asterisk. 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. The current review fee balance for this project is \$199,775.75.00 and must be paid prior to the acceptance of your resubmittal.

Your estimated Planning Commission date is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, November 23, 2021, and your City Council date is tentatively scheduled for Monday, December 20, 2021. Please remember that all abutter notices for public hearings must be sent and the site notices must be posted at least 10 days prior to the hearing date. These notifications are your responsibility and the lack of proper notification will cause the public hearing date to be postponed. It is important that you obtain an updated list of adjacent property owners from the county before the notices are sent out. Take all necessary steps to ensure an accurate list is obtained, to include checking with adjacent builders if development activity and/or sales are taking place on properties adjacent to your site.

As always, if you have any comments or concerns, please feel free to email or call me. I may be reached at atibbs@auroragov.org or 303-739-7227.

Sincerely,

Aja Tibbs, Planner II
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Jeff Norberg, PCS Group, 200 Kalamath St, Denver CO 80223
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison
Cesarina Dancy, ODA
Filed: k:\\$DA\1707-07rev1.rtf



Initial Submission Review

SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- Land use changes are only permitted through a zone map amendment and cannot be processed through a master plan application or adjustment process. Uses which are currently not permitted or are a conditional use cannot become by-right unless rezoned to a district that they are permitted by-right. Review planning comment 1A for additional details.
- Most of the master plan submittal has been copied from previous applications or other development projects within the city. They do not address the site-specific opportunities and constraints that apply to this project and are not well organized between tabs. This is an essential part of the Master Plan process and must be corrected with the second submittal.
- Planning Areas should be smaller in include more specific land use and density information and coincide with the PIP.
- Small Blocks and walkable park space need to be emphasized and detail added as a key element of the flexibility and density allowances with this proposal.
- Street Sections will need to be addressed as they relate to standard street sections.
- Park space need to be addressed and detail added to meet the goals of the zoning allowances, in particular the approach to medians and perimeters spaces compared to park spaces.
- Neighborhoods are typically 100 to 200 acres in include a variety of land use focused on areas of high activity or amenity, identify assets and challenges of each neighborhood and how they are addressed.
- The use of evergreen trees within the curbside landscape is not permitted by code. This may have been permitted in Painted Prairie but was not a blanket approval for future developments.
- Sod is not permitted in the curbside landscape unless the curbside landscape is 10' or greater.
- Provide landscape standards for commercial and industrial buffers that address building perimeter as well as street and non-street buffers.
- The expectation from Public Works is to use standard city street sections.
- There are identified MHFD stream management corridors on site and downstream that may require improvements, page 4.
- Planning areas tend to be broken into smaller areas. With this level of detail, consider breaking down the planning areas into product types or potential homebuilder clusters. Based on the descriptions, there are many public improvements that will be required prior to the first CO based on this area layout. Consider breaking down the planning areas by the neighborhood descriptions provided
- Review MUS checklist (included at end of redlined plans PDF) and check that all items have been completed and included as appropriate.
- Refer to comments on the traffic master plan study
- Update your land dedication calculations to meet PROS current standards
- Note that several of your proposed open spaces areas do not meet land dedication standards, namely the E470 Multi-use easement and the median open space.
- The proposed school site does not meet APS location criteria.
- A permit will be required from E-470 for any encroachment or disturbance to E-470 ROW or MUE prior to construction
- E-470 will be widened to 3 lanes in each direction beginning in 2022. Any regional drainage facilities adjacent to E-470 should include the additional runoff associated with the widening.
- No response was received from Mile High Flood District regarding this referral request, Planning would anticipate comments with the second review.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. General Planning (Aja Tibbs / atibbs@auroragov.org / 303-739-7227 / Comments in dark teal)

Below is a general summary of the high-level issues related to the Windler Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment Submittal. Please refer to the redlined plan documents for specific comments from myself, Sarah Wile and Brandon Cammarata; all addressing general planning issues that need to be addressed with the second submittal.

**Zoning Map Amendment**

1A. Standards within the master plan application cannot impact the zoning or the table of permitted uses as they apply to each zone district. The letter of introduction indicates an intent to allow specific conditional uses as permitted uses (self-storage, and warehousing/distribution) or uses which are not permitted within the existing zones (accessory dwelling units). State law and municipal code prohibit this type of request outside of rezoning the property to a zone district in which the uses are permitted by-right. Please revise this statement to be consistent with the UDO and/or amend the zoning map amendment application, if desired (please see note below). Please feel free to contact me if further discussion/explanation is needed.

Note: If you are considering rezoning, please note that all rezoning applications are evaluated by specific criteria including, but not limited to, compliance with the comprehensive plan and compatibility with surrounding development, and an industrial or other special purpose zone district may not be considered appropriate for this area. In other words, the current zone districts are appropriate and compatible for the area, because the industrial and more intense uses are appropriately restricted. A conditional use process for these uses is necessary to consider their suitability for the area and surrounding development, and any special site considerations that may need to be addressed when locating within a mixed-use development.

1B. At the time of platting, the zone district boundaries cannot split a lot or create an illogical pattern of development within a block. Please be aware that an adjustment to the zoning boundary would be required at the time of plat, if the lot and block layouts do not follow a platted lot line with a thoughtful transition or block layout along/between the zone district boundary.

1C. The proposed zoning amendment may impact compliance with the Aurora Places Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, residential zone districts which allow SFD uses have not been historically accepted within the City Corridor Placetype without a Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment. Please provide additional analysis regarding compliance of the proposed zone map amendment to the Aurora Placetypes.

Tab 1 and 6 - Narrative and Introduction Letter

1D. Update these letters to address the use issues outlined in the zoning section above.

1E. The fence adjustment request will not be supported as a “universal or blanket” adjustment for the project. There will be specific areas (i.e., an E-470 sound wall or buffering with dissimilar uses) that will require more than the signature fence proposed. To be considered, the master plan must further break down the specific locations that the adjustment is appropriate, provide diagrams and details of the additional landscape buffer that will be provided in each location, and demonstrate the fence types that will be provided in the areas which appropriately require a more significant fence (with columns).

1F. Two critical elements needed to enable the higher densities and flexible lots in the FRLO neighborhoods are small blocks and walkable parks space. A third element that is integral to this approach is a diversity of products and uses in each neighborhood and in many cases within blocks. Mixing products and builders within blocks and between blocks can contribute to these goals. These areas of emphasis need to be part of all of the tabs and is an expectation for the overall development as well as evaluation of each neighborhood and individual phases or filings.

Tab 4 - Existing Conditions and Site Analysis

1G. The intent of a Master Plan application is to analyze and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of a development property. To understand the opportunities and constraints of each proposal. This should begin with Tab 4 and moves into the design sections of Tabs 6-12. The drafted Tab 4 document is only covering the surface of basic development issues/requirements and missing several other critical issues. The analysis must go deeper and should be weaved into the design elements of the plan. It is unclear how the opportunities and constraints of the site are reflected in the design elements of the master plan. How will this master plan invite unique development that is appropriate for the site location?

**Tab 8 - Land Use Map and Matrix**

1H. The proposed neighborhoods have no sub-area breakdown and do not align with the PIP. Densities and product type need to be further detailed so that they can be adequately tracked and agreed upon. Mixing of product type within each neighborhood is encouraged, but the plan needs to generally identify how much of each type will be developed and how that mix will vary by neighborhood and sub-area. Typically, neighborhoods are 100 to 200 acres in size and include a variety of land uses focused on a high activity areas or unique amenity. In most cases neighborhoods should not simply follow zone district boundaries.

1I. The proposed map indicates that the MU-A neighborhoods will not be developed using the Flexible Residential Lot Option (FRLO). The UDO does not allow mixing the FRLO in the same development as the Small Lot Option. Therefore, the drafted document is indicating that the MU-A areas will be developed using the MU-A standards. Please verify and confirm.

1J. The PA labeling is difficult to follow on the land use map. Please consider starting with the larger development areas first, and finishing with the smaller open space areas. They should all remain together in the appropriate planning area or sub-area, but it is difficult to tell which areas are in each neighborhood with the current numbering system.

1K. The Parks and Open Space calculations are using the wrong ratio and a significant portion is listed for cash-in-lieu. FRLO's need to provide an above and beyond system of developed parks and amenity access. There should be a clear link to small lots and proximity to amenities. As noted in your standards, all lots should be within ¼ mile of a usable and accessible park, but the master plan should also require increased access to amenities for higher density (lots smaller than standard). In the FRLO neighborhoods small lots should be at least 800 feet from a minimum ½ acre park. Adding this guideline to the design standards and more park locations to the land use will help to identify the benefits of the FRLO.

1L. MU-A and MUR zoning have specific requirements that need to be addressed through in all of the tabs. MU-A is limited to 50% of the land area for residential uses. MUR only permits higher density residential products and has a number of specific requirements for mixed use and commercial areas including a walkable main street, focal points and high visibility sites. Locations and design principles for these requirements need to be included in the master plan.

1M. Please include at least one administrative active center on the east side of the development. In the context of this development, the activity center may be a neighborhood level center less than 10 acres in size. Typically, these would be located at the intersection of two collectors and accommodate small neighborhood scale businesses. Examples might include a small multi-tenant building, a daycare etc.

Tab 9 - Open Space and Circulation Plan

1N. Identify the characteristics of the neighborhood and community connections. Street sections are not needed at this stage, but what design elements will be present along these pathways? Will they include protected bike lanes, special signage or art, increased landscaping buffers, etc.? How will amenities such as parks and open spaces be focused along these corridors? The urban design standards, landscaping standards, and other applicable documents all need to relate to this plan. They should align and the standards should provide a clearer picture of what these routes will look like in preparation for platting and site plan applications.

1O. Revise plan address the site analysis, narrative and land uses issues identified in earlier comments. The documents should all speak to each other and address the unique site issues.

1P. There is no indication throughout the Master Plan what the neighborhood areas or names signify. What are the boundaries drawn on page 4, and what is their purpose? How will each of the areas be distinguished in design, character or land-use? Additionally, it appears that the boundary of the Windler Source neighborhood is inconsistent with the zoning, land-use and other tabs included in the Master Plan. Please revise and clarify.



1Q. Revise the tables on Tab 9 to be consistent with changes requested on the land use map matrix. Parks and open spaces should align with the PIP and planning areas for phasing. Link the improvement triggers to planning areas and PIP triggers rather than CO's.

Tab 10 - Urban Design Standards

1R. These need significant re-organization, and clean-up. The regulations are not consistent with the subject property and use terms and references that are not a part of this submittal. Tab 10 should provide guidelines and design responses to the constraints and opportunities identified the narrative and site analysis sections of the Master Plan. Avoid drafting specific standards or regulations in this section, but provide a clear picture and description for staff to use during the site plan and platting stages of development.

1S. All sections of Form F-1 should be provided for EVERY use proposed in the master plan. For example, signage standards need to also consider wayfinding, monument, office, and flex/logistics uses beyond just commercial uses. Most of the standards that have been provided only address a specific use or part of the development.

1T. Modify the standards to address issues raised in other section of the master plan. These need to be consistent with the land use and adjustment issues previously commented upon. The design guidelines need to provide supporting principles for the maps and narratives of the plan that can be translated and detailed at the time of site plan and plat. For example, a strong picture needs to be drawn for the FLRO areas. Guidelines should indicate that blocks will be no longer than 660' and bounded on all sides by a public street, parks no smaller than 3 acres will be developed within a ¼ mile of every residential lot, and lots smaller than the zone district standard will be within 800' of a minimum ½ acre park.

Tab 12 - Design Standards

1U. There are no commercial design standards or vertical mixed-use standards. Table is noting that commercial design standard will be included in future "town center submittal" which is not applicable to this project.

1V. Notes in the standards indicate that a in masonry requirements for residential structures could be considered by the DRC. This request could only be granted through an adjustment process. Refer to notes through the pattern and style types – there are a few architectural standards that would be better suited with additional masonry to meet the UDO requirements.

1W. In some places, the flex/logistics standards seem too specific for a master plan and will conflict with the UDO. Please be cautious of creating standards to specific and make sure that they will meet or exceed the UDO requirements.

1X. Address how the historic farmstead will be preserved and rehabilitated. What guidelines and principles are appropriate for this historic site?

Tab 13 – Public Improvement Plan (PIP)

1Y. The PIP and neighborhood areas do not reflect each other and need to be aligned. There must be a direct link between the planning areas and neighborhood boundaries in the Land Use Map and Matrix with the PIP areas, and timing of public improvements.

1Z. PIP improvements need to address any phase organized in any manner. In other words, what improvements would be required if you started at any phase of the project? Consider emergency access, existing utilities and site conditions, surrounding development, and master planned improvements.



1AA. Public improvements such as parks and streets must correlate with the applicable design standards. There should not be conflicts between each other and terminology of the improvements should be consistent between the documents (i.e., what is the difference between and collector, parkway A, and community connector? Not only do they have different routes, but they are not explained in the guidelines.) Ensure that all public areas will meet or exceed city standards.

1BB. Placeholder to address coordination of public improvements with surrounding / adjacent development

Pattern Book

1CC. The pattern book does not necessarily need to be a separate document. It appears that much of the information within this document is repetitive of the design standards. Take the extra pieces of this document (that are relevant and non-repetitive) and place them in the appropriate Master Plan tabs. Remove site design details such as setbacks, lot sizes and site-specific planting details. This level of detail is typically worked out during the site plan stage and can create conflicts with the master plan if prematurely included.

1DD. Expectations of small block sizes, proximity to traditional neighborhood or pocket park spaces and diversity of products, uses and builders needs to be interwoven into the pattern book/design standards of the master plan.

Avigation Easement

1EE. The redlined avigation easement has been reviewed by the city attorney's office and returned with redlines as attached to this letter. The following notes were provided regarding the review:

1FF. The edits provided are acceptable except Paragraph 8(b) adding drones. This goes beyond the avigation easement and speaks to drone regulation outside of Airspace boundaries. It should be stricken entirely.

1GG. Question regarding Paragraph 2 and 7 and "licensed operator" of DIA being a co-grantee to Aurora. What are the parties understanding of who the licensed operator is? I think that DEN will have to agree with this definition. A referral has been sent to DEN – comments will be forthcoming via separate cover or at second submittal.

2. Landscape Design (Kelly K. Bish, PLA, LEED AP / kbish@auroragov.org / 303-739-7189 / Comnts in red/teal)

2A. The Pattern Book

1. Why does this Pattern Book only address residential? There are industrial commercial uses being proposed as part of the overall development.
2. Give more specifics as to where lawn in this scenario is intended to be used. Front yards of homes cannot have less than 400 contiguous square feet. Curbside landscapes must be 10' wide minimum.
3. Planning and Aurora water do not support the use of sod as "accents".
4. Please refer to the UDO. The UDO has specific requirements for building perimeter landscaping for townhome developments. The standards provided do not address the current UDO requirements.
5. The Site Plan when submitted will need to provide the specific plant quantities for all the various building product types. The Site Plan is used by our inspectors for issuance of certificates of occupancy.
6. It appears as if all the product types with front yards will not accommodate sod and will be considered xeric. Please refer to table 4.7-3 Residential Yard Landscape Requirements for specific features that will be required within the xeric front yards. Aurora Water offers builders a \$1,000 tap credit for each home that is xeric.
7. Please note, the green court areas themselves will need to be meet the common open space tract landscape requirements of 1 tree and 10 shrubs per 4000 sf.
8. Is the thought that there would not be space for a tree in the front yards due to the proximity to the street and the street trees?



2B. Tab 8 – Land Use

1. Update the Standard Notes where indicated.

2C. Tab 9 – Open Space and Circulation

1. Indicate on the Open Space and Circulation Plan where the Recreation Center is proposed. The symbology is in the legend, but it is not on the plan graphic.

2D. Tab 10 - Urban Design

1. General Comment: There has been no definitive/specific fencing, furniture or entry monumentation provided to express what the aesthetic look or theme of this development is intended to be. Designs for the various types of entry monuments should be included representing the primary, secondary and community identifications. Height, materials, colors etc.
2. Update the page numbers to reflect the correct pages.
3. Include the actual lighting and furnishing intended to be used for the parks, streets etc. Do not show generic examples.
4. According to page 2, item 1 Entry Monumentation the pink circles below are supposed to be primary entry monumentation locations. If this is not correct, then the text in item 1 should be changed. If correct, then the graphic needs updating to reflect this.
5. If example street cross sections are going to be provided, make sure they actually represent what is intended to be constructed and they should be designated on a plan map and reference a specific street(s).
6. Change tree lawn in the cross sections to curbside landscape.
7. The street cross section on page 19 and page 18 appear to be identical other than the label for a bulb-out, but the actual bulb-out is listed, but not shown.
8. The cross sections provided do not appear to match the ones in the PIP.
9. For the Connection Through Open Space, Connection at Open Space and Neighborhood Street At Open Space street cross sections, why isn't a detached walk being provided on both sides of the street?

2E. Tab 11 - Landscape

1. Correct the note/footer on the bottom of page.
2. Update the street frontages language to include the quantity of one tree per 40 feet and that street trees shall be deciduous canopy trees with ornamentals as accents to be reviewed by staff on a case by case basis.
3. Update the curbside landscape requirements. Sod is not permitted unless the curbside landscape is 10' in width of greater and evergreen trees are not permitted in the curbside landscape to serve as street trees.
4. Update the curbside landscape requirements to include shrubs and /or ornamental grasses shall be provided at a ratio of one per 40 linear feet.
5. Update the street buffer landscape requirements per the comments provided.
6. Parking lot islands are not permitted to have more than 30% ornamental grasses.
7. Update the trash enclosure requirements per the comments provided.
8. Provide landscape standards for commercial and industrial buffers that address building perimeter as well as street and non-street buffers.
9. Specify in the Urban Design Standards the type of fencing to be used for trash enclosures.
10. Update the landscape standards per the comments provided on sheet 6.
11. Remove multi-family and green courts from Table 11.1 Minimum Plant Requirements.
12. Update Table 11.2 per the comment provided. The table is proposing buffering solutions less restrictive than the UDO and that is not permitted.
13. Are there only three species of trees permitted as street trees?
14. Correct Coffee Tree spelling.
15. Update the Streetscape Planting Concepts graphic to read better and to identify also the road types like local, collector and arterial etc.
16. The Streetscapes Concept sheet should not include the use of evergreen trees as a street tree. They are not permitted by code. Street trees are to be deciduous canopy trees.



17. Curbside plantings should be based upon the total square footage of the curbside area and not just the shrub bed being provided.
18. Perennials cannot make up more than 5% of the curbside total plant count.
19. Remove the language that alludes to the use of turf grass in the curbside landscape.
20. The use of evergreen trees within the curbside landscape is not permitted by code. This may have been permitted in Painted Prairie but was not a blanket approval for future developments.
21. Sod is not permitted in the curbside landscape unless the curbside landscape is 10' or greater.

3. Transportation Planning (Tom Worker-Braddock / tworker@auroragov.org / 303-739-7340 / Comnts in teal)

3A. Design Standards and PIP

1. 56th Avenue southern portion will need to reflect north portion, including separated bike lanes.
2. Several of the bicycle facility types here don't match the bicycle facility types on the PIP typicals.
3. Sidewalks should be reflected on interior streets, as part of pedestrian connections

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

4. Public Works / Kristin Tanabe / ktanabe@auroragov.org / 303-739-7306 / comments in green)

4A. Tab 10 Urban Design

1. Notes about railing encroachments and pavers.
2. Questions about expectations for streetlights.
3. The expectation is to use standard city street sections.

4B. Tab 13 PIP

1. The master plan will not be approved by public works until the master drainage study is approved.
2. Add information on future potential signalized intersections and reference the City's traffic signal escrow ordinance, page 4
3. Include transitions to existing roadways as needed, page 4.
4. There are identified MHFD stream management corridors on site and downstream that may require improvements, page 4
5. The improvements listed with each area are required to be identified independent of the development of other areas. Ensure each area has the required improvements independent of other area developments, page 6.
6. Planning areas tend to be broken into smaller areas. With this level of detail, consider breaking down the planning areas into product types or potential homebuilder clusters. Based on the descriptions, there are many public improvements that will be required prior to the first CO based on this area layout. Consider breaking down the planning areas by the neighborhood descriptions provided
7. Identify the intersections that have been indicated as future potential signalized intersections (Figures)
8. Label the interior roads described in the narrative so the completeness of the roadway network can be evaluated
9. Include roadway improvements in planning area exhibits with a different hatch/color. Typical all exhibits Consider removing the other interior roadways that are not specifically identified in the narrative
10. See additional comment and detail in redlines.

NOTE – Master Drainage is being reviewed under RSN 1557137 and the first review will be completed soon.

5. Utilities Dpt. /Aurora Water (Tony Tran / atran@auroragov.org / 303-739-7376 / comnts. in red)

5A. Master Utilities

1. Review MUS checklist (included at end of Redlined Plans PDF) and check that all items have been completed and included as appropriate.
2. Provide history and background from 2004/2006 MUS and updates provided herein, page1.
3. Verify pipe materials and C values, page 3
4. page 4, How do revised peak flows compare to previous studies/assumptions? Especially for SS tie-ins to interceptors and list sources of data.
5. Show drainageways and MHFD stream corridor and identify basins, sheet A1.
6. See redlines for additions details and comments.



Note sampling stations will be required - let's coordinate on number and best location, sheet A1

5B. Tab 13 PIP

1. page 8 - Discuss relocation of 36" WL in Gun Club/Denali and reasoning

5B. Tab 11 – Landscape

1. Aurora Water does not support the use of cool season grasses, including hybrids in non-active use spaces, sheet 4. Timothy York, PLA, CLIA/ tyork@auroragov.org/ (303) 326-8819

6. Traffic Engineering (Steven Gomez / segomez@auroragov.org / 303-739-7336 / Comments in gold)

6A. Master Traffic Study

1. Refer to comments and redlines on the proposed plans. E-470 Freeway Analysis is not needed on the Appendix, please remove.
2. Check trip generation calculations. Number of dwelling units in text is different than in trip generation table.
3. Provide further discussion on pass-by percentage, internal capture methodology, and non-auto reduction.
4. Check volume balances between intersections in background, project trips, and total. There are missing vehicles between intersections that do not show to have access in between.
5. Provide 2040 background analysis for comparison purposes
6. Provide analysis of roundabouts shown on Main Street and Drive 4.
7. Update the auxiliary lane lengths per City of Aurora guidelines that references CDOT Access Code. Review operations and volumes at intersections where a reduction in turn lanes may be possible. Marked on the appropriate figures.
8. Check Synchro lanes. A few are missing an approach or showing lanes that do not match Figures 4,5,6. Can the intersection numbers in Synchro match the maps? It is difficult to compare when they are different.
9. The Progression analysis needs to be revisited. The link bandwidths were listed and not the corridor.
10. Provide signal timing sheets.

6B. Tab 9 – Open Space and Circulation Plan

1. Open Space and Circulation Plan access control is not consistent with TIS.
2. The number of dwelling units on page 3 is not consistent with TIS.

6C. Tab 13 – PIP

1. Number of units is not consistent with TIS or Open Space & Circulation Plan
2. Label Interior Road 7
3. Add Gun Club Road Improvement
4. Show and label Interior Road 5 on Pg. 13 and 15
5. Interior Road 6 a typo on Pg. 34?
6. Adjust Interior Rd. 12 extent to south boundary of Area 5
7. Gun Club Road not identified in Area Roadway Improvements
8. EB lanes identified in discussion. WB lanes part of Harvest Mile FDP.

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

7A. No comments on the Master Plan

8. Life Safety (Mark Apodaca / mapodaca@auroragov.org / 303-739-7656 / comments in blue)

8A. Tab 8 Land Use

1. Page 5: See comment to add a note for the Whelen siren system.
2. Page 6: See comment to revise note 8.
3. 8A. Tab 8 Land Use

8B. Tab 13 PIP

1. Page 3: See multiple comments for section Fire Life Safety Standards.

8C. Master Utilities

1. Page 1: See comment to add Fire Department to the signature block.



9. Parks and Open Space Michelle Teller/ mteller@auroragov.org/ 303-739-7437/ Comments in purple.

9A General:

1. Update your land dedication calculations to meet PROS current standards.
2. Note that several of your proposed open spaces areas do not meet land dedication standards, namely the E470 Multi-use easement and the median open space.
3. Coordinate with PROS on some of the proposed open space land dedication locations and how redistribution of some of the open space will occur.
4. The new master plan manual includes new PROS requirements for providing CAD or GIS data for all park and open space parcels. This data is recognized as ‘conceptual’ and does not require the locations to stay the same at time of site plan. This data helps PROS to better review for service radius gaps, connectivity and provide up to date information on approved master plan open space plans. Prior to finalization, please submit your CAD files or preferably a GIS geodatabase which includes only the polygons and lines associated with proposed parks, open space, and trails. Reach out to Michelle Teller for further information.

9B. Land Use Map Tab 8:

1. See redlines.

9C Open Space Tab 9:

1. See redlines within Tab 9.

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

10A. Please review redlines and coordinate directly with Roberta. Please summarize changes in your response letter.

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

11A. Based on the number and types of residential units proposed in the Windler master plan, the development is projected to yield over 1,800 school aged children. The school land dedication requirement based on this land use plan is approximately 42 acres. (Refer to attached school student yield calculations)

11B. Aurora Public Schools will need at least one school site to serve the future Windler residents. The school district’s prototype P-8 school requires a site of approximately 18 acres and has the capacity to serve approximately 1,000 students. APS prefers a school site between 20 and 25 acres in order to provide the district flexibility to design a unique school campus capable of serving a larger number of students in the Windler community and potentially more grade levels. This acreage is net and does not include land for streets, pre-existing easements, trails, storms drainage, excessive slope or any other condition that would preclude development of the entire site. The site should be compact and rectangular or square in shape. APS requests that the school site be more centrally located within the Windler development and away from arterial roads in order to provide easier access for more students. The site should also be located adjacent to intersecting non-arterial streets to allow separation of car and bus traffic.

11C. Aurora Public Schools will require cash-in-lieu for any school land obligation above the acreage dedicated. Cash-in-lieu is based on fair market value of zoned land with infrastructure in place.

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

12A. 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.

12B. A permit will be required from E-470 for any encroachment or disturbance to E-470 ROW or MUE prior to construction.

12C. Either the City or the permittee will be responsible for maintaining all improvements constructed within the ROW and MUE in perpetuity.



12D. Here is a link to our permit: <https://www.e-470.com/Pages/WorkingWithUs/Permits.aspx>

12E. E-470 doesn't recommend residential uses adjacent to the highway.

12F. E-470 isn't responsible for noise mitigation.

12G. All disturbed areas shall be reseeded with E-470 approved seed mix unless otherwise noted, this includes all work in the MUE.

12H. E-470 will be widened to 3 lanes in each direction beginning in 2022.

12I. Any regional drainage facilities adjacent to E-470 should include the additional runoff associated with the widening.

12J. A 10' wide concrete trail will be constructed along the west side of the highway in the MUE during the widening project.

12K. A comment/response document would be helpful to track the revisions to each submittal.

12L. Additional comments will be issued as design progresses.

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

13A. Please see attached letter dated July 30, 2021.

14. Colorado Department of Transportation (Steve Loeffler / steven.loeffler@state.co.us / 303-757-9891)

14A. No response to comment request.

15. Adams County Dept. of Planning and Development (developmentsubmittals@adcogov.org / 720-523-6859)

15A. No response to comment request.

16. Mile High Flood District (AKA UDFCD) (submittals@udfcd.org / 303-455-6277)

16A. No response to comment request, Planning would anticipate comment with the second review.



Right of Way & Permits

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

July 30, 2021

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

Attn: Aja Tibbs

Re: Windler, Case # DA-1707-07

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk has reviewed the request for the **Windler Zoning Map Amendment and Master Plan**. Please be advised that Public Service Company has existing electric distribution facilities within the areas indicated in this area and has no objection to this 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.

For future planning and to ensure that adequate utility easements are available within this development and per state statutes, PSCo will be requesting the following type/width utility easements *within each lot*:

- standard single family -- 6-feet on front for natural gas and 8-feet on rear for electric
- alley loaded single family -- 6-feet for natural gas and 8-feet for electric; if natural gas and electric are within the same trench, a 10-foot wide utility easement is required, not to overlap any wet utility easement
- commercial/retail -- 10-feet around perimeter of each lot, particularly abutting all public rights-of-way
- apartment-type -- 10-feet around perimeter of each lot, particularly abutting all public rights-of-way
- all tracts -- 10-feet abutting all public rights-of-way
- natural gas distribution facilities require a minimum 5-foot clearance from any structure and where there is drivable pavement with space for service truck access (8-feet wide, 6-inches thick; truck rated concrete, rock, etc...) with plowing in snowy conditions

As the project progresses, 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.

Additional easements will need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities (i.e. transformers) – a Right-of-Way and Permits Agent will need to be contacted.

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