

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



Worth Discovering • auroragov.org

October 18, 2021

Kory Whitaker
Habitat for Humanity of Metro Denver
3245 Eliot Street
Denver, CO 80211

Re: Second Submission Review – Mountain View Community Homes Zoning Map Amendment, Site Plan and Final Plat
Application Number: **DA-2269-00**
Case Numbers: **2021-2004-00; 2021-4013-00; 2021-3033-00**

Dear Mr. Whitaker:

Thank you for your second submission. 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 remain, however they may be addressed in a technical submission. Please revise your previous work and send us a technical submission after the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council hearings.

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 let me know. I may be reached at (303)-739-7121 or dosoba@auroragov.org.

Sincerely,

Dan Osoba, Planner II
City of Aurora Planning Department

cc: Roxanne Jacobson, EV Studio
Brandon Cammarata, Planning Manager
Scott Campbell, Neighborhood Liaison
Daunte Rushton, ODA
Filed: K:\\$DA\2200-2299\2269-00rev2



Initial Submission Review

PLANNING DEPARTMENT COMMENTS

1. Community Questions, Comments and Concerns

- 1A. Please see the attached comments from outside agency referrals at the end of this letter. Comments were received from: Xcel Energy
- 1B. Please see the compiled community questions, comments, and concerns below. These will be compiled with others received after this review and included in the Planning and Zoning Commission agenda packet.
- 1C. Name: Steven and Lisa Farley
Address: 2007 S Kingston Ct, Aurora CO 80014
Phone: 3039177312
Email: sp-farley@hotmail.com

Comment: This letter is written in protest of the proposed zoning change noted above from R-1 – Low density single family district, to R-2 – Medium density district.

We respectfully request that this zoning change be denied for the following reasons.

1 – The property in question is surrounded on all sides by R-1 zoned properties. Rezoning this parcel would constitute a “spot rezoning” which is an almost unheard-of event.

2 – Habitat for Humanity is the organization that is spearheading this rezoning. While the goals of Habitat are laudable, in a property development and legal sense, they are simply a real estate developer. Nothing more and nothing less.

3 – If this spot rezoning is granted, this will set a precedent that other developers will demand the right to use. Spot rezoning will become the expectation of real estate developers rather than an extremely rare exception. This will leave the City of Aurora open to endless and expensive litigation.

4 – Habitat has been unwilling to set forth a R-1 proposal stating that, “...it would be incompatible with their model.” without giving hard, numerical specifics on what that model entails. We, as a community, have asked repeatedly why R-1 zoning is off the table. Habitat has been unresponsive and indignant concerning this line of questioning.

5 – The ownership of this parcel was granted to the Mountain View Community Church for church use. While expansion of church facilities was the likely the original intent for the additional land, it is unclear if Wayne Laws and Habitat have the legal right to embark on creating a housing development.

6 – The point people for this development are Wayne Laws and Habitat for Humanity. These parties are only temporary partners with this church. Neither Wayne Laws nor any of the Habitat representatives live within 5 miles of the site. They are not members of the effected community.

We have no qualm with building affordable single family homes on this site. Our neighborhood is made up of R-1 single family homes of sizes ranging just over 1,000 square feet up to several times that size. Habitat for Humanity’s own guidelines state that homes they build shall integrate harmoniously with the surrounding community.

We simply ask that Habitat for Humanity live up to the harmony they espouse and the codes that this neighborhood lives by. They shouldn’t force unprecedented change on a place many of us have called home for decades.

- 1D. Name: Hamid Ahmed
Address: 2000 S Jamaica Ct, Aurora, CO 80014
Phone: 3036674532
Email: kassala19@gmail.com

Comment 1-The deed given to the units owners on this development limited to the structure only. The land ownership is not transferred to the new owner. Any new loan issued to the purchase of any of these properties will be limited to the value of the building, excluding the lot. Usually regular lenders don’t finance these type of transactions. Does Habitat guarantee the availability of financing for the next 99 years?. What will be the expected impact on the value of neighboring properties? and if there is a significant depreciation



who is responsible?

2- The Bargain and Sale Deed recorded with the Arapahoe county clerk, at reception# B4135448. Shows that the Ecumenical Ministries Inc was the Grantor and Mountain View Community Church was the Grantee. The lot was given to the Grantee under this condition: IN TRUST, THE PREMISES HEREIN CONVEYED SHALL BE USED, KEPT, AND MAINTAINED BY THE GRANTEE FOR WORSHIP AND OTHER PURPOSES OF ITS MINISTRY AS A PARTICULAR MEMBER OF THE ECUMENICAL MINISTRIES, INC. SUBJECT TO ITS BYLAWS.

Questions:

A-There is a clear requirement to keep and maintain the property, does that mean the church is responsible of maintaining the property after the construction is complete?

B-The Church will sign a 99 years lease with Habitat and will no longer be responsible of maintaining the property. Isn't that a violation of the Trust Deed?

Possibly Invalidating the church's ownership of the lot.

1E. Name: Rica Shea

Address: 10701 E Evans Ave, Aurora, CO 80014

Phone: 3038098749

Email: sheafamily23@msn.com

Comment: I live in Ward IV and am deeply opposed to the Habitat for Humanity proposed build involving Mountain View community church. I feel it will be extremely detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the current residents. The influx of a multi-family site would cause too much disruption to the traffic, crime, walkability, and general desirability of our neighborhood not only negatively affecting our way of life but the safety of our families due to increased traffic flows on streets not meant to handle that sort of influx. I would not be opposed if the build were a cul-de-sac with 6-7 houses as compared to the rest of the neighborhood. This would add an additional 28 people to the neighborhood and keep Havana Heights as R-1 zoning. The current proposal would change the zoning and would have a minimum of 80 people living overcrowded in a 2.5-acre space. (Presuming only 80 people live there - who knows if multiple families will move into the housing? There are no rules in place to restrict it). Also, where will the 30-40 cars be on this property? Will the Church allow additional parking on their property? The Cherry Creek schools are already at capacity, so where will the children go to school? How will they safely walk to school in a neighborhood with limited sidewalks and increased traffic flow?

We were told by church officials, prior to purchasing our house, no construction would be placed on the land. The property was to be used by the church for church purposes, ie park, garden or possible minister housing. We all purchased our property in this neighborhood under the R-1 zoning with the implicit intent to enjoy our quiet, very walkable, and safe neighborhood. The church already has a second business running out of the church and has massive overflow of cars into the streets weekly for church rentals.

The church reports this is their "vision" of helping the community. The church is not being considerate of the Havana Heights' vision. I bought here because this is a quiet neighborhood. It will no longer be quiet and safe if 80 people are crammed into a 2.5-acre space. Also, how are they helping the community when these people will never own the land under which their house is built? They will always be tenants/renters.

If the land is being donated by the church, the labor donated by Habitat volunteers, the materials donated by corporations, and Habitat holds the mortgage - then I don't understand why Habitat and the church refuse to build a cul-de-sac that matches the current homes? Habitat can make the mortgage whatever they want to help 6-8 families and still make money as everything has been donated. This option would keep the 150 homeowners of Havana Heights happy, safe, and healthy.

Finally, if this land will no longer be used for church purposes, and therefore should no longer be tax exempt, will the city of Aurora be assessing property taxes on the individual homes?



I don't feel Habitat for Humanity and Mountain View Community church have adequately informed the city of our opposition to changing the zoning of our neighborhood. Please keep our neighborhood R1.

1F. Name: David and Valerie Marshall

Address: 10795 East Evans Avenue, Aurora, CO 80014

Phone: 3035964461

Email: vjmarshall63@gmail.com

Comment (1): Based on the information we have received regarding the Mountainview Community Home proposed development, I am requesting that the City of Aurora Planning and Zoning Committee deny this project for the following reasons:

1) The application does not comply with the Master Plan conveyed through the Original Deed that includes the property, and any conditions specifically applied to development of the property.

a. The only Title Document posted online was a Bargain and Sale Deed signed by Craig Peterson, Ecumenical Ministries, Inc. on 8/14/2006 stating: "In trust, the premises herein conveyed shall be used, kept, and maintained by the Grantee for worship and other purposes of its ministry as a particular member church of Ecumenical Ministries, Inc., subject to its bylaws."

b. When neighbors and former members of the church moved to Havana Heights, they were specifically told by Craig Peterson, as representative of Ecumenical Ministries Inc., that the field would NOT be developed.

c. "Worship and other purposes of its ministry" cannot be defined as conveying the property to a commercial developer for an undisclosed sum in a 99-year lease. The current 99-year land lease appears to further be a way that the church is trying to circumvent the original intention of the deed. Neither the church nor the developer will disclose the amount being paid for the lease to the neighborhood.

2) Havana Heights' existing infrastructure and public improvements, including but not limited to its water, wastewater, street, trail, and sidewalk systems, do not have adequate capacity to serve the proposed development.

a. There are limited sidewalks on Joliet between Evans and Iliff and heading east on the south side of Evans from Joliet to Lima. People and their dogs walk in the street. Eighty additional people and cars would post a major safety hazard.

b. The developers have not made it clear who will be responsible for maintaining the retention pond to insure the homes south of the project do not incur water damage and leakage.

c. As of 2020 there were no taxes due. This is projected to be a high-density, residentially developed, property; however, it will technically be on Ecumenical Ministries, Inc.'s land. When questioned, it appears that no taxes, and thus community support, for the additional traffic, infrastructure, sewer, road wear and tear during development, school support, etc. will be taxed on the land whatsoever.

d. There are limited egress and ingress points in the neighborhood.

i. Evans onto Havana is a right turn only exit with no light. Joliet exits onto Iliff which is a very busy street that already suffers from extensive traffic buildup during rush hours that extends all the way to Lima at times.

ii. While Lima does have a light, the Rodeo Drive community only has a single opening onto Lima only about 50 feet from the traffic light. Again, traffic is so backed up during rush hours that those neighbors have a hard time getting out of their community onto a public road (Lima). The community itself is filled with retired and elderly people who often need medical attention.

3) The application is not compatible with surrounding uses in terms of size, scale and building façade materials. Mountain View Community Homes is proposing a development with 20 units / 2.05 acres = 9.75 units/acre with on average four persons per household or 80 individuals. Additionally, approximately 70% of the proposed units will not have garages and there will be no fencing on any of the units.

Ecumenical Ministries, Inc. and Habitat for Humanity's comparable developments should be designed to reflect a similar site size and density, as found in the adjacent properties that surround their proposed project



within our Havana Heights' neighborhood. According to Gold Compass Real Estate's website describing Havana Heights, they say, "The majority of the Havana Heights homes for sale were built by 2018 with 1500-3000 above grade square footage. The floor plans average 2000-4000 finished square feet and have a 2-car attached garage. Almost all homes have a basement and few of them have a walkout space as well. Most homes in Havana Heights sit on manicured lots of 7500 square feet to half an acre", which equals 2 to 5.8 units/acre, (with many on multi-acre sites)."

4) The application does not mitigate any adverse impacts on the surrounding area to the degree practicable. We have met with the developers and the church multiple times requesting the following:

- a. Larger lot sizes that would remain within the R-1 zoning and be comparable with the surrounding neighborhood.
- b. Additional off-street parking
- c. Attached garages
- d. Lot and common area maintenance. Since the new land-lease homeowners won't even own their land, we have requested a centralized body (?HOA? ?Church?) be responsible for the overall maintenance of the land and common areas. The proposed vegetation and weed barrier maintenance and watering of common area plants has not been addressed. Who will maintain them?
- e. Because they will be building upon a lot that has historically produced a lot of weeds, natural vegetation and gardens, the current plans call for a very limited weed barrier with quite a bit of zero-scaping. If not properly maintained this will produce LOTS of weeds. If you look at the front of the church's current property adjacent to their parking lot fronting Evans, they also do not maintain their weeds and have done nothing this entire 2021 Summer to even begin to mitigate the problem.
- f. Safety and welfare of the residents within our community during construction.
 - i. We have requested information from the developers on how construction will be handled since they propose this will be over a 3-year time period. However, they have ignored our concerns: How will construction hours be handled since the proposed high-density development is in the middle of a quiet, single-family, R-1 zoned neighborhood?
 - a. Will the hours be limited? (i.e., 9am-5pm Monday through Friday)?
 - b. Where will heavy machinery and construction vehicles park?
 - c. Since there are multiple untrained volunteers helping to construct the homes, and Ecumenical Ministries, Inc. has not offered to supply parking, will they be shuttled in to keep parking down?
 - d. What is the timeframe for any associated street repairs be handled in a prompt and timely manner, so as to keep the neighborhood streets safe?
 - e. How will neighbors be notified of any street closures or heavy construction times?
 - f. What security measures will be provided during and after construction? The construction site will be a target for theft, especially with the cost of construction goods rising as much as it has. Is Ecumenical Ministries, Inc.'s church or Habitat for Humanity going to have security on site? The construction site will invite theft not only to the site but the surrounding neighborhood.

5) Major Site Plans are not designed to preserve and protect natural areas and wildlife habitat of riparian corridors, wetlands, and floodplains affected by the proposed development and to integrate those areas into site design where practicable. This neighborhood has grown significantly within the past 5 years. Most of the land was previously open space. The neighbors have been diligent about trying to keep some open space for our local wildlife (songbirds, rabbits, squirrels, raccoons, bats, bees, foxes, coyotes, hawks, and ducks, to name a few). Yet, there is nothing in the Site Plan to address the concern of the neighborhood for losing so much open space for animal habitat.

As stated in the neighborhood's previous letter which sums up our feelings well, "Aurora originally did a great job of planning our neighborhood as an R-1 zoned community. It is one of the reasons we have all scrimped and saved our money to live here, and many of us have retired here. We love our walkable streets



and lot sizes. Our neighborhood is united in the belief that the zoning remains R-1 to maintain the health, safety, and quality of life we love in our Havana Heights neighborhood. We would welcome another low-density, R-1 cul-de-sac in the proposed site, just as we have done since the formation of the neighborhood. Thank you for the opportunity to respond.

1G. Name: Theodore Barker

Address: 2149 S Joliet Ct, Aurora, CO 80014

Phone: 3036966993

Email: tcbarker01@aol.com

Comment: Based on information presented at public meetings and filed with the City, I am requesting that the City authorities deny the Mountainview Community Home Project from proceeding. Unsatisfactory conditions and flaws exist.

Starting with a “view from above” approach, the multi-family units proposed are inconsistent with the surrounding single-family residences. Multi-family units in other areas of Aurora blend in with adjacent similarly designed residences.

The future additional automobile and pedestrian traffic may not be well served by streets and sidewalks.

From the northeast corner of the property, there are no city blocks that have sidewalks on both sides of the street, creating a risk to children walking to/from schools, some over one mile. Some children may have to be bussed to school resulting in more road traffic on adjacent 25-MPH streets with no traffic signals.

Will reported sandy soil conditions near or at the project site make functionality of the retention pond and construction practices difficult and costly?

Habitat’s concept of “open” backyards facing Joliet Street is incompatible with security of property and safety of people, particularly children. As author Robert Frost wrote: “Good fences make good neighbors.”

At a public meeting, when Habitat was queried by an attorney, the described control/ownership of the property and residences was unclear and raised concerns. Is the proposed scheme consistent with the City’s requirements and practices? Does the reported 99-year lease exist? If so, why? Who are the “merchant associations” and “developer successors” the drawing notes reference?

In a public meeting, when Habitat was asked the cost of the project, indirectly, the average price of each of the 20 residences, Habitat replied it did not know. Similarly, the proposed schedules for design, permitting, site preparation, construction, “selling” of the units are not clear. Given these potentially extended schedules, it could be that the housing units may be too expensive for the intended residents; hence, an unfeasible project that could be unoccupied an extended period.

In closing, the description of the project is incompatible, flawed, potentially too expensive, may not comply with City Code and Standards, and does not support the motto “Aurora (including Havana Heights), a good place to call home.” Thank you for your consideration.

1H. Name: Brenda Rivard

Address: 2080 S Jamaica Ct, Aurora, CO 80014

Phone: 3039278009

Email: borbrivard@yahoo.com

Comment: I understand the need for affordable housing, but request the Zoning Commission and the City Council consider the needs of the current neighbors. The congestion created by the proposed development that goes with the requested rezoning will totally change the identity of the current neighborhood. The zoning should remain R1.

The projected zoning change does not match the current neighborhood. Currently single family homes (R1 zoning). If we assume 2 cars per home, the proposal equates to 40 vehicles vs 14 vehicles in cul de sac directly across. If we assume 4 persons per home, the proposal equates to 80 people vs 28 in the same area in cul de sac directly across. Zoning should remain R1.

2. Zoning and Land Use Comments

2A. Zoning and Land Use comments have been addressed.



3. Parking Issues

- 3A. Parking issues have been resolved.

4. Architectural and Urban Design Issues

- 4A. Architecture and Urban Design issues have been resolved.

5. Signage Issues

Sheet 1

- 5A. Please remove the signage maximum from the data block as a 96 s.f. neighborhood sign is not permitted at a local/local intersection.

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

Site Plan Comments

Sheet 8

- 6A. It appears based upon the line type shown that fencing is being proposed. Include a detail of the fence i.e material, color, height etc.
- 6B. Under the General Landscape Notes, a number appears to be missing. Should be "7".

Sheet 9

- 6C. Under the General Landscape Notes, a number appears to be missing. Should be "7".
- 6D. For water conservation purposes, the city does not allow strips of sod less than 10' in width. These areas will need to be shrubs and ornamental grasses. The requirement would be 1 shrub per 40 sf. No more than 40% of that total may be ornamental grasses.
- 6E. Show the property line as a traditional line type. A long dash and two short dashes.
- 6F. Is fencing being proposed? If so, add to the legend. Please review the fencing requirements relative to the setbacks from sidewalks.
- 6G. Some of the homes do not appear as if they will meet the 400 sf of sod in the front yard based upon the other planting requirements as noted. See the red symbol noted on the lots that seem to be in question.
- 6H. For the front yard planting requirements, when more than 9 shrubs are being provided there must be a minimum of 3 different species.
- 6I. Because both streets have attached sidewalks, there is not a requirement for curbside landscaping.
- 6J. Only 9 shrubs not 10 as noted in the table are being provided in the detention pond. Provide the additional shrub.
- 6K. Provide the species on the landscape plan for the street trees. Because the front yard trees are also being used to satisfy the street tree requirement, they should be specified.

7. Addressing (Phil Turner / 303-739-7357 / pcturner@auroragov.org)

- 7A. Please provide a digital .shp or .dwg file for addressing and other GIS mapping purposes. Include the parcel, street line, easement and building footprint layers at a minimum. Please ensure that the digital file provided in a NAD 83 feet, Stateplane, Central Colorado projection so it will display correctly within our GIS system. Please eliminate any line work outside of the target area. Please contact me if you need additional information about this digital file.

REFERRAL COMMENTS FROM OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

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

Site Plan Comments

Sheet 1

- 8A. The Site plan will not be approved by Public Works until the Preliminary Drainage Report is approved.
- 8B. Remove the erosion control plan from the Site Plan set.



Sheet 2

- 8C. Make sure the flowline radius is being labeled. 15' minimum radius is required.
- 8D. What does the hatch represent? Please label it.
- 8E. Label the radius.
- 8F. No hatch shown for the proposed asphalt.
- 8G. Label the flowline radius.
- 8H. 15' radius is required for the ROW.

Sheet 3

- 8I. 2% is the standard cross slope for sidewalks. Adjust the grading accordingly.
- 8J. Max 2% cross slope on the sidewalk.
- 8K. Where is the swale?
- 8L. The sidewalk must slope towards the street.
- 8M. Why is there no inlet?
- 8N. Why are there two curb transitions?
- 8O. Label the slope of the swale. 2% is the minimum.

Sheet 4

- 8P. The plans call out for vertical curb.
- 8Q. FL-FL dimension for Evans and Joliet is closer to 38'.
- 8R. The sidewalk on Evans is shown as attached.
- 8S. Detailed grading for the curb ramps is not required for the Site Plan submittal.
- 8T. An access easement is required from the drainage easement to the public ROW for maintenance access.
- 8U. Show/label the maintenance access to the pond bottom and the top of the outlet structure. Show/label 100-yr water surface elevation, indicate direction of emergency overflow and show the spillway.

Sheet 6

- 8V. Remove erosion control plan for the Site Plan set.

Sheet 7

- 8W. The cul-de-sac is labeled as public right-of-way. Street lights must meet COA standards for this street as well.
- 8X. Street light required at intersection.

Final Plat Comments

- 8Y. 15' radius is required. Please match the Site Plan.

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

Site Plan Comments

Sheet 2

- 9A. Show the existing stop signs.

Sheet 9

- 9B. Review the COA STD TE-13.3 (Tree vs stop sign). This first tree may need to shift east slightly.

10. Fire / Life Safety (Ted Caviness / 303-739-7268 / tcavines@auroragov.org / Comments in blue)

Site Plan Comments

Sheet 1

- 10A. Remove notes 3 and 4, they do not apply.

Sheet 2



10B. Remove “proposed fire hydrant”. No new hydrants are needed for this site. Reflect this change on all sheets.

11. Forestry (Becky Lamphear / 303-739-7139 / rlamphea@auroragov.org / Comments in purple)

- 11A. Trees located around the detention pond may require removal due to the grading. When the site plan is submitted, please show and label all existing trees on a separate sheet called Tree Mitigation Plan and indicate which existing trees will be preserved or removed. Please include grading on this sheet as well.
- 11B. Tree mitigation is always above and beyond the Landscape Code requirements. Any tree that is removed from this site will either require replacement within the landscape or be mitigated through payment to the Community Tree Fund.
- 11C. Any trees that are preserved on the site during construction activities shall follow the standard details for Tree Protection per the current Parks, Recreation & Open Space Dedication and Development Criteria manual. The Tree Protection notes shall be included on the plan. The link for the manual can be found at: <https://auroraver2.hosted.civillive.com/cms/One.aspx?portalId=16242704&pageId=16529352>

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

- 12A. Please contact Aurora Water directly for all water comments.

13. Real Property (Maurice Brooks (Ryan Nelson) / 303-739-7294 / mbrooks@auroragov.org / Comments in magenta)

Site Plan & Plat Comments

Generally

- 13A. Please see the redlined comments on the Site Plan and Plat. There are several comments that apply on many/all sheets.

14. Revenue (Diana Porter / 303-739-7395 / dsporter@auroragov.org)

- 14A. Storm Drainage Development Fees are due: 2.06-acres x \$1,242.00 = \$2,558.52.



Right of Way & Permits

1123 West 3rd Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80223
Telephone: **303.571.3306**
Facsimile: 303. 571. 3284
donna.l.george@xcelenergy.com

August 27, 2021

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

Attn: Daniel Osoba

Re: Mountain View Community Homes – 2nd referral, Case # DA-2269-00

Public Service Company of Colorado's (PSCo) Right of Way & Permits Referral Desk still has some **conflicts** and requests a comment response to the second referral for **Mountain View Community Homes**.

Please note that the 8-feet is not sufficient for both (dry) utilities and drainage, and requests that 1-2 feet is added to all rear lot utility easements, making a grand total of 10-feet for both drainage and electricity.

Additionally, Lots 5 and 6 are further compromised by storm sewer utilities taking up all of the 5-foot utility easement SPACE allotted on these lots along the south property line of this development.

PSCo acknowledges the requested 6-foot-wide easements for natural gas abutting the front lots of the internal right-of-way roadway to a cul du sac.

Space consideration must also be given to locate pad mount transformers and pedestals within this development.

The property owner/developer/contractor is reminded to complete the application process for any new natural gas or electric service, or modification to any existing facilities via xcelenergy.com/InstallAndConnect. It is then the responsibility of the developer to contact the Designer assigned to the project for approval of design details.

Additional easements *will* need to be acquired by separate document for new facilities (i.e. transformers) – be sure to contact the Designer and request that they connect with a Right-of-Way Agent.

Public Service Company 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.

As a safety precaution, PSCo would like to remind the developer to call the Utility Notification Center by dialing 811 for utility locates prior to construction.

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