

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



Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

March 26, 2019

Randy Hertel
Majestic Realty Co
20100 E 32nd Parkway, Suite 150
Aurora, CO 80011

Re: Third Submission Review - Majestic Commercenter – FDP and Rezoning
Application Number: DA-1127-31
Case Number: 1996-2005-03; 2018-7005-00

Dear Mr. Hertel:

Thank you for your third submission, which we started to process on Tuesday, March 5, 2019. 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 a technical submission after the Planning Commission decision which is scheduled for, March 27, 2019. Please revise your previous work and send us a new submission.

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.

It is suggested that we schedule a meeting to review these comments and discuss the comments and redlines. To schedule a meeting, I may be reached at 303-739-7251 or bcammara@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Brandon Cammarata, Senior Planner
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Katie Laughlin - Consilium Design 7353 S Alton Way Ste A135 Centennial, CO 80112
Susan Barkman, Neighborhood Services
Jacob Cox, ODA
Filed: K:\SDA\1127-31rev3.rtf



SUMMARY OF KEY COMMENTS FROM ALL DEPARTMENTS

- ✓ The Public Improvement Plan (PIP) will require significant work as there are several areas where the expectations or parameters are not clear.
- ✓ A TIS was not submitted with the 3rd Review. An updated TIS will be needed to proceed with the next review.
- ✓ Remove the word “possible” from various sheets and narratives relating to future improvements.
- ✓ Include recommended language relating to Oil and Gas sites and Outdoor Storage.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

Reviewed by: Brandon Cammarata / bcammara@auroragov.org / 303-739-7251 / PDF comment color is teal.

1. Community Comments

1A. James Dyer, Inivair Aircraft Corporation, 2500 Himalaya Rd., Phone: 303-375-8882

Email: jdyer@univair.com

No objection to rezoning but do support as much extra vehicle ingress and egress from the area, especially Himalaya Road and 32nd Ave. Access to our Business has been steadily more difficult for the past number of years due to the increase in truck, employee, and construction traffic in the area. Recommend full in and out access on Himalaya and 38th

2. Completeness and Clarity of the Application

General

2A. Remove the word “possible” from numerous plan sheets and narratives relating to future improvements. (i.e., “Possible Future Himalaya Road”) If the applicant would like the City to be aware of specific considerations regarding the construction of various improvements, then those considerations should be included in the PIP and PIP narrative for discussion. **“possible” has been removed from the plan sheets and narratives. Specific considerations will be included in the PIP.**

Tab 1 Cover Letter

2B. Please include an updated cover letter when you upload your technical submittal.

Included/uploaded.

Tab 3 Context Map

2C. Include existing platted lots in MCC I and MCC II per the required items in the FDP Manual Section 3.3.

Platted Lots have been added.

Tab 6 Form B Narrative

2D. Please provide an updated Form B with your next submittal.

Form B has been updated.

Tab 8 Land Use Map

2E. Please update the naming of Planning Areas in MCC1 to be numeric. (ie 11, 12, etc). You may keep the descriptors as you have them after the number. **The planning areas have been updated.**

2F. Please update Form D per redlines.

Form D has been updated.

Tab 9 Open Space & Circulation

2G. In general, the expectation is that individual sites will have pedestrian connections to the First Creek Trail or share a connection with other sites. **Each site anticipated to have individual or shared access, to be determined at CSP.**

Tab 11 Landscape Standards

2H. Oil and Gas

Please use the following language:

Oil and Gas sites will be screened and landscaped in a manner consistent with the FDP and City requirements. All oil and gas sites shall be enclosed by an opaque fence with a maximum height of nine feet, a berm, or a wall with a maximum height of nine feet in combination with landscaping that conceals the view of the facilities from streets,



highways, trails and publicly accessible spaces. Landscaping shall consist of one tree and ten shrubs per 40 linear feet of a 25-foot wide perimeter buffer and appropriate ground cover. **Oil and Gas standards will be determined at CSP review.**

Please use the following language:

Where outdoor storage is permitted as an accessory use, the outdoor storage areas will be screened and landscaped in a manner consistent with the FDP and City requirements. All outdoor storage shall be enclosed by an opaque fence with a maximum height of nine feet, a berm, or a wall with a maximum height of 12 feet in combination with landscaping that conceals the view of the facilities from streets, highways, trails and publicly accessible spaces. Landscaping shall consist of one tree and ten shrubs per 40 linear feet of a 25-foot wide perimeter buffer and appropriate ground cover. **Language revised.**

Tab 12 Architectural Standards

2J. The “Service Areas” description is not clear and needs to meet or exceed code. Please either delete this statement entirely or provide language that is compatible with code requirements in Section 146-915. **Service area section deleted.**

Tab 13 PIP

2K. Please include both the PIP map and Narrative together under Tab 13 and assure any PIP in the Master Utility Plan is consistent. **Both the PIP and PIP Narrative are in tab 13.**

2L. 32nd Parkway and median is a defining design element of MCCI. Please identify the approach for 32nd Parkway in MCCII. The expectation is the median feature be carried through MCCII. **The median was constructed by a previous developer and is not considered a defining feature. Accordingly, it will not be extended through MCCII.**

3. Zoning and Land Use Comments

3A. Review of rezone description and authorization submitted March 22, 2019 is not complete.

4. Landscape Comments

Kelly K. Bish, PLA, LEED AP/ Kbish@auroragov.org/ (303) 739-7189/ PDF comments in teal.

Tab 10

4A. Add additional language to the building setbacks that states that landscape buffers will need to be met, when applicable and that there will not necessarily be no setbacks or zero setbacks. Buffers are not dependent upon building size. **Language added to state that 5’ landscape buffers will be required, regardless of building setbacks.**

4B. Note – building setbacks may be measured from the property lines, but buffers are measured from back of walk. **We were directed in comment 2FF from on our second submission review to establish setbacks from the back of the sidewalk.**

Tab 11 Landscape Standards

4C. Update the language under Building Perimeter Landscaping. **Language updated**

4D. Add language to the parking lot interior landscaping requirements to include the installation of landscaped parking lot islands along the building face. See comment on plan. **Parking lot islands along the building face are not included.**

4E. Update the landscape standard for a low continuous hedge screening parking lot from 2.5’-3’ to 3’-4’. **The current landscape standard is 2.5’ – 3’. We will meet the current standard.**

4F. Update the decorative masonry wall requirements from 2.5’-3’ to a minimum of 3’ tall. **The current standard is 2.5’ – 3’. We will meet the current standard.**

4G. Expand upon the statement under the oil and gas facilities screening requirements “ A water connection is presently available to provide for an automatic, underground irrigation system as required”. Not sure what is meant by this. **Language revised for clarity.**

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES



5. Civil Engineering

Kristin Tanabe, ktanabe@auroragov.org / 303-739-7306 / Comments in green.

PIP Narrative

5A. Improving First Creek to Urban Drainage and Flood Control District's (UDFCD) maintenance eligibility standards and constructing a regional detention pond are both required for developing this property. Aurora staff have agreed that regional improvements would not be required for development of PA-4, with the condition that this planning area provide its own detention and water quality treatment, and that a stable outfall to First Creek be provided. ~~This agreement does not apply to any other planning areas. (Craig Perl)~~

5B. Moving forward, a conceptual design should be developed, based on hydrology, hydraulics, geomorphology and other disciplines. This plan should identify when certain improvements are needed based on the impacts of this

5D. Previous comment regarding report format not addressed. Bullet points are not a narrative. A suggested narrative outline is available upon request. **Narrative revised and provided in Report format.**

5E. "Possible future" is not acceptable. The narrative should address the reasons why an alignment will or will not occur, typical. **Narrative revised and provided in Report format.**

5F. Remove "possible future" language regarding traffic signals and refer to the traffic study, city ordinance, etc. for traffic signal requirements, typical **Narrative revised and provided in Report format.**

5G. PA-3c - Previous comment: PA-4 was the only planning area specifically approved to move forward prior to First Creek Improvements. **Understood.**

5H. PA-9 - This improvement is not only related to the development of PA-9 but may be required with other planning areas based on traffic or life safety needs. It is a major improvement that should not be associated with a single planning area **Narrative revised and provided in Report format.**

5I. PA-10 - This is not a phasing plan. Just because it is numbered last does not mean it would develop last. Discussion should also include that this area has been identified on the exhibit as possible detention and not developed for industrial use. **Narrative revised and provided in Report format.**

5J. "Notes:" These elements should not be notes at the end, but part of the general development parameters (see suggested PIP outline) and Interim improvements to First Creek also need to be included. **Narrative revised and provided in Report format.**

PIP Map

5K. Include a typical section for Himalaya Road. **The extension of Himilaya will potentially be completed with the development of PA-14. Please refer to the PIP Narrative.**

5L. How will this be accomplished? Is this reflected in the Master Traffic Study? (northbound Himilaya) **Once a decision is made on Himlaya, a TIS will be prepared.**

5M. What if a reimbursement agreement is not possible with Xcel? This development needs to address those improvements. (Picadilly adjacent to Xcel) **It is expected the city will reimburse developer for those expenses if Xcel will not.**

5N. The traffic study needs to address the alternatives. **TIS will be completed for Himilaya once it is determined**

6. Traffic

Brianna Medema, bmedema@auroragov.org / 303.739.7646

TIS

6A. An update TIS was not submitted on 3rd review. The next review submittal will require a n updated TIS in order to proceed with the review. **We apologize, an updated traffic study wasn't resubmitted as all previous City traffic study comments were addressed in the February 2019 study. That study has been resubmitted as requested.**

Tab 13 PIP Narrative

6B. PIP documents do not identify adjacent developments responsibility. Remove these notations. **Removed.**

6C. 32nd Pkwy to 26th Ave is not "possible" but expected/required. Update accordingly. **Based on agreement with the City, either 26th Avenue will be realigned to 32nd Parkway or 32nd Parkway may be relocated to 26th Avenue. It isn't known at this time which of these realignments will occur, and therefore the term "possible" is believed to be correct. The traffic study evaluates one fully aligned**



intersection.

6D. Substitute "if Traffic volumes support the limited movement, as per City Traffic Impact Study Criteria"

6E. No, 50% for 1/2 of intersection. 50% for MCC II. Justification for 1/4?

6F. Change may to shall for PA 32nd Ave. **Same comment as above in 6C.**

6G. With each PA development, ADT of Picadilly just south of the intersection of 38th Ave & Picadilly shall be measured. If the ADT is over 12,500 ADT, widening of Picadilly from 2 lanes to a minimum of 4 lanes (or ultimate width) shall be required with the PA in development. **Understood.**

6H. Add "Internal roadway network shall be completed to Planning area boundary as identified in the Master Traffic Impact Study." For each PA that has internal site interconnectivity, include which PA it will share interconnectivity and identify the other PA and build & dedicate public/shared access easements. **Understood.**

PIP Map

6I. All Traffic Engineering comments on the PIP Narrative apply here.

6J. Remove "To Be Northbound Only. No Southbound Traffic" If you would like to add a comment on limited movement at intersection of 38th & Himalaya Rd pending Traffic Impact Study and COA analysis - ok. **Per Discussions with the City, the northbound only option for Himalaya is still a potential and is still included in our plans and narrative**

7. Real Property

Maurice Brooks/ mbrooks@auroragov.org / 303-739-7294 Comments in **magenta**.

7A. No comments at this time.

General

8A. Under the certification statement, please update to reference the COA standards and specifications for water, sanitary sewer and storm drainage infrastructure. **Certification statement updated to include water, sanitary sewer and storm drainage infrastructure.**

8B. Please remove storm sewer from this utility study as this is addressed with the drainage reports. **Section has been removed.**

8C. Please revise project site acreage to be 540 Acres throughout the report text. **Project acreage has been updated.**

8D. Please review MUS Exhibit requirements and provide updated exhibits that meet the outlined criteria from the MUS checklist. **Updated exhibits provided in Appendix per criteria listed in the MUS checklist.**

8E. Provide an approval block on the water and sanitary sewer exhibits. **Approval block provided on required exhibits.**

Water

8F. The proposed water main size in 38th Ave is 12-inches not 24-inches per the City's CIP and GVRE MUS (CP#218184). Please include excerpts from the GVRE MUS in the report appendix and update model accordingly. **GVRE excerpts have been provided in Reference material, WaterCAD model updated for MaxDay and MaxDay + FF to confirm the 38th Avenue 12-inch public watermain meets requirements in a "worst-case" scenario.**

8G. Please note in text and show 60" Steel PWP raw water line on water exhibits. **60-inch Steel PWP raw waterline added to exhibits.**

8H. Reference in text and include updated MUS design criteria (June 2018) in appendix.

- Please revise Max Day Demands (3360 GPD/AC) and FF Demands (3,500 GPM for 3 hrs + Max Day) to be consistent with design criteria.
- Acknowledge and demonstrate Max Velocity and Max Hour Head Loss criteria was met.
- Please indicate how the 40% building coverage was applied or remove from the text.
- Provide pipe material head loss coefficients used. **Report updated per MUS Design Criteria (June 2018)**

8I. Please use the elevations based from contour data and a Zone 3 HGL of 5720' to calculate model min/max pressures in lieu of an assumed pressure of 90psi. **HGL Elevations updated in Report and Model**



per the COA Zone 3 HGL of 5720'.

8J. Discuss required public main extensions to serve the initial planning areas and provide a standalone model for this initial phase which indicates what public main extensions will be needed. **Separate analysis was modeled to ensure extents of required public waterlines to service the planning areas.**

8K. Provide water figure of pipe network in water model with all pipes and nodes labeled.

Exhibit of proposed network provided in Report Appendix.

8L. Show hydrants nodes can supply required FF of Max Day + FF per S5.02.2 Table 1.

Report and Model updated to confirm Max Day + Fire Flow requirements.

8M. Once approved, please provide the electronic water modeling files compatible with InfoWater. **Understood.**

Sanitary Sewer

8N. There is a reference to pre-app notes indicating the First Creek Interceptor (FCI) is to serve the site, please include in Appendix.

IV A: Please expand in the text of the report what the maximum design capacity dedicated to MCCII in the FCI per any discussions with the City and assumptions with the City's masterplan. **FCI maximum design capacity allowance dedicated to MCCII developed discussed in Report and provided in Reference.**

IV B: Please clarify that only public main extensions will be allowed to the FCI and that direct service connections will not be allowed. **Connection requirements to public FCI discussed in Report.**

8O. Reference in text and include updated MUS design criteria (June 2018) in appendix.

MUS Design Criteria (June 2018) added to Report and calculations, also provided in Appendix.

8P. Separate Sanitary Sewer calculations from water calculations in Appendix B Table.

- List peaking factor used and breakout Inflow and Infiltration (non-peaked) from Average Flow in design flow summary for Appendix B Table.
- Provide a table that shows which assumed planning areas and design flows (GPD and CFS) are tributary to each DP and how that relates to flows in the FCI as you move upstream do downstream throughout the site.

Show contour data on exhibit and indicate what elevations were assumed to obtain pipe slope calculations.

Sanitary Calcs have been separated from water calculations. New table lists peaking factor along with Inflow and Infiltrations from Avg flow in summary provided.

PIP Narrative

8Q. Make corrections to MUS and include discussion of utility infrastructure requirements. **Discussions added to PIP Narrative per updates to the MUS.**

PIP Map

8R. Update per MUS comments and label existing and proposed utility sizes. **PIP has been updated per MUS revisions included in the provided report.**

10. Parks and Recreation (PROS)

Reviewed by: Chris Ricciardiello / cricciar@auroragov.org / 303-739-73xx

PIP Narrative

10A. PA-11 - Add "Potential 10-foot wide concrete trail with pedestrian underpasses integrated into the box culvert/bridge designs between Picadilly Road and 38th Avenue." **The crossing at Picadilly will have a pedestrian underpass incorporated. The 38th Ave crossing is being designed by others but will also try to incorporate a pedestrian underpass.**

10B. PA-3C - Add "integrated into the box culvert/bridge design." **see above comment**

10C. PA-9 - Add: ", including a potential pedestrian underpass integrated into the box culvert/bridge design." **see above comment**

**11. Forestry**

Rebecca Lamphear / rlamphea@auroragov.org/ 303-739-7139

No additional comments on third review.

12. Xcel

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way and Permits Referral Desk reminds the property owner/developer/contractor to contact the following in relation to possible conflicts with existing electric transmission facilities and high pressure natural gas transmission pipelines:

- for Electric Transmission: Mike Diehl, Siting and Land Rights Manager at 303-571-7260
- for High Pressure Natural Gas Transmission:

https://www.xcelenergy.com/working_with_us/builders/encroachment_requests

PSCo is requesting that the City of Aurora send us notification after approval of the proposed annexation has been finalized. This notification should be sent to Sandi Cardenas (303-571-3635) at: Xcel Energy, 1123 West 3rd Avenue, Denver, Colorado 80223 or sandra.cardenas@xcelenergy.com. This will allow our mapping department to make the necessary updates to our mapping system.

PSCo also owns and operates existing natural gas distribution facilities along the northerly property line and overhead electric distribution facilities along the westerly property line, and reminds the property owner/developer/contractor to complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to existing facilities via FastApp-Fax-Email-USPS (go to: https://www.xcelenergy.com/start_stop_transfer/installing_and_connecting_service/). The Builder's Call Line is 1-800-628-2121.

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

13. Urban Drainage

13A. The previous comments (10/25/2018 and 1/17/2019) for this project still apply. UDFCD continues to have no objection to this proposal. (See previous comments below)

13B. The proposed site is bisected by First Creek, a major drainageway. This area is included in the 2010 *First Creek (Upstream of Buckley Road) Major Drainageway Plan Conceptual Design Report* (MDP). The MDP includes improvements for stream stabilization, regional detention, and roadway crossing improvements.

13C. FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for this area recognize First Creek as a flooding source for Special Flood Hazard Areas (SFHA), effective date February 17, 2017. The source of SFHA is the 2011 *First Creek (Upstream of Buckley Road) Flood Hazard Area Delineation* (FHAD). We have been communicating with the improvements through a Fee-In-Lieu Improvements agreement between the MCC and UDFCD. This would be a similar arrangement that we have with the Aurora Commerce Center south of this site for which we are designing and constructing improvements to First Creek from Smith Road to 1000' north of 26th Avenue.

13E. It appears that they are making concessions for the regional detention basin and a stream corridor. We appreciate that the FDP figures illustrate a stream corridor that is respectful of the existing alignment and accounts for that. In our discussions with the development team the exact corridor alignment and width needed for First Creek has not been determined at this time and is likely to change as those plans develop.

13F. We have no objections to this zoning request and the FDP or any materials currently presented in the FDP.



14. Transportation Planning.

Tom Worker/Braddock / tworker@auroragov.org / 303-739-7340

14A. No additional comments.

15. Public Art

Roberta Bloom, rbloom@auroragov.org / 303-739-6747

15A. Please clarify if the intent is to spend the entire public art budget in the area east of Piccadilly Road. **Yes, the entire public art budget will be used in the area east of Piccadilly Road.**

15B. Is the intent to divide the funds equally between the 6 potential sites or to have one signature piece with other satellite pieces? **The intent is to have multiple sites, the exact number unknown at this time. The document shows potential locations, not all will be used.**

15C. While it is OK to state that tentative timeline will coincide with these various components, it would be helpful to have some estimates....such as estimated to begin in fall 2019 and continue through spring 2020...or whatever is relevant. It just provides a little context even if that changes. **Estimated initial process to begin 2022, this note has been added.**

15D. There are eight potential sites for art shown on the map. Originally, I thought there were 6, and that seemed like too many. With 8 sites, if the funds were divided equally, that would allocate approximately \$27,250 per site, which is not very much. I recommend dropping at least two sites, and those would be the sites along E-470 because it seems that they would have little public accessibility. **Sites shown are only potential location options. Not all will be used.**

15E. While functional elements such as artist designed shade structures and lighting elements are appropriate, it is important to understand that these elements cannot double as signage. Signage will not qualify as public art. **Understood.**